Strategic Initiatives Formative Evaluation of the Institute of Indigenous Government — British Columbia

Evaluation and Data Development
Strategic Policy
Human Resources Development Canada
and British Columbia Ministry of Education

March 1998

SP-AH088-03-98E
(également disponible en français)

106-02629/

Acknowledgements

The formative evaluation of the Institute of Indigenous Government Strategic Initiative was prepared under contract by L. McElroy & Associates for the Institute of Indigenous Government; the Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs; the Ministry of Education, Skills and Training; and Human Resources Development Canada.

The Evaluators would like to thank all those who participated in the evaluation study, and especially, the students, instructors, non-instructional staff and administrators of the Institute of Indigenous Government (IIG). These busy people willingly gave their time to this evaluation to provide feedback and suggestions on how the IIG could be improved. Their commitment to the ultimate success of the IIG was evident in their openness to the evaluation and the candour of their responses. We are grateful for the trust they have placed in the evaluators, and in the evaluation process.

The evaluators offer a very special thank you to Sylvia Walsh, a faculty member of the IIG, who was the IIG's contact for the evaluation. She has contributed greatly to this evaluation in countless ways. Thank you Sylvia for responding to our requests so promptly and with such generosity of spirit.

We would also like to acknowledge the federal government and provincial government for their joint contribution to funding the Institute of Indigenous Government Strategic Initiative, as part of the Strategic Initiatives Program to test new approaches to social security reform in British Columbia.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary i

Management Response vii

1. Introduction 1
- 1.1 Overview of the Institute of Indigenous Government 1
- 1.2 Funding for the Institute of Indigenous Government 2
- 1.3 Strategic Initiatives Objectives for the IIG 3
- 1.4 Purpose of the Evaluation 3
- 1.5 Evaluation Methodology 4
- 1.6 Limitations of the Methodology 7
- 1.7 Organization of the Report 8
- 1.8 Caution About Interpretation 8

2. Implementation 11
- 2.1 Relevance 11
- 2.2 Implementation Status 15
- 2.3 Student Profile and Enrollment 21
- 2.4 Recruitment 25
- 2.5 Access 29

3. Operations 37
- 3.1 Physical Resources 37
- 3.2 Financial Resources 41
- 3.3 Reporting, Monitoring and Evaluation 55

4. Management Direction 63
- 4.1 Management of the IIG 63
- 4.2 Education Council 71
- 4.3 Communication 75
- 4.4 Partnerships 80
- 4.5 Governance of the IIG 83

5. Summary of Conclusions 89
- 5.1 Summary of Main Conclusions 89
- 5.2 Overall Conclusions 92

Appendix A 95

Appendix B 97

Appendix C 101

Executive Summary

The Institute of Indigenous Government

The Institute of Indigenous Government (IIG) is Canada's first autonomous, degree-granting Indigenous-controlled post-secondary institution. It was designated as a provincial institute under the British Columbia's College and Institute Act in 1995. The mission of the Institute of Indigenous Government is *"to provide an accredited specialized program of post-secondary education, skills-training and research opportunities dedicated to empowering Indigenous Peoples to exercise their right of self-determination in their territories in ways which fully reflect Indigenous philosophy, values, and experience throughout the world."*

Funding for the establishment and development of the IIG was provided, mainly, through the Strategic Initiatives Agreement between the Province of BC and the government of Canada. This Agreement provided for matching contributions from the provincial and federal governments for IIG's first three years, from 1995/96 to 1997/98, totalling $4.98 million. The Provincial Agreement with the IIG also provided for basic funding for the IIG until 2000.

The rationale for the Strategic Initiatives funding of the IIG was to provide an Aboriginally controlled, post-secondary institution that delivers curriculum incorporating Indigenous philosophy, cultural values, and social experience, to address the specific needs of Aboriginal students in order to enhance the rate of completion among Aboriginal people and enhance their success in finding work upon graduation.

The IIG has a unique mandate to deliver a specialized, culturally relevant curriculum on Indigenous government studies, in a learning environment that supports the needs of Aboriginal students that have not been met in traditional mainstream educational institutions. This unique mandate gives rise to the following requirements for the IIG to deliver:

- student supports not typically found at mainstream institutions, such as:
  - resident elders to bring Indigenous philosophy and cultural values into the institution;
  - counselors for support to students in coping with the traumatic effects of being a member of a marginalized group; and
  - academic support programs to address the students' academic weaknesses that are the result of ineffective mainstream educational experiences.
- library resources that deal with Indigenous government issues, as well as usual library resources found at post-secondary institutions; and

- programming delivered in communities throughout British Columbia as well as student supports and library resources for extension students.

The Institute began instruction in the Fall of 1995 on the IIG's downtown Vancouver campus. IIG courses have also been offered at two extension sites, in Saanich and Lillooet. The IIG offers a two-year program of courses leading to an Associate Degree in Indigenous Government Studies, as well as a one-year certificate program, and plans to offer a four-year program leading to a Baccalaureate in Indigenous Government Studies by 1999-2000.

Evaluation Purpose and Approach

Evaluation of the IIG is a requirement of the Strategic Initiatives Agreement. The evaluation was overseen by a committee consisting of representatives of the IIG, the Union of BC Indian Chiefs (UBCIC), the Ministry of Education, Skills and Training (MoEST) and Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC). The first phase in evaluating the IIG, an evaluation framework, was completed in January of 1997, by L. McElroy & Associates. This, the formative evaluation of the IIG, was the second phase in the evaluation of the IIG. The main purpose of this evaluation has been to identify the strengths of the IIG and to determine how to build upon these strengths so the IIG can be improved to ensure its success.

Three primary methods of data collection were used for the evaluation: interviews, focus groups and review of documents. The following data collection components were used:

- interviews with IIG administrators, instructors and non-instructional staff;
- interviews with selected members of the IIG Board of Governors and the Union of BC Indian Chiefs;
- focus groups with, and a brief survey of, IIG students;
- focus groups with the two Aboriginal communities that have participated in the IIG extension program;
- focus groups with two Aboriginal communities that have not participated in the IIG extension program;
- interviews with external stakeholders, including Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal post-secondary organizations in BC, and the provincial and federal government; and
- review of documents and records.

Summary of Main Conclusions

Relevance: The mission of the IIG is viewed as a major strength of the Institute and is seen as highly relevant to the Aboriginal students who are attending the IIG. The education plan for the IIG is viewed as appropriate to its Mission. Students' expectations are being met and the majority are satisfied with the IIG's academic program.

Implementation: With only nine weeks to create the Institute, from hiring staff and developing curriculum, to recruiting and registering students, the IIG has achieved a significant accomplishment. It has developed and delivered a certificate program and an associate of arts degree program, and is developing a four-year Baccalaureate program. However, the IIG has encountered two significant barriers that have hampered its implementation: lack of time for adequate planning and insufficient financial resources to fully carry out its plan. As a result, the IIG has not achieved its enrollment targets, has had difficulty providing all the additional student supports (described above, such as elders) needed to deliver its mandate and it has not been able to deliver the extension program in the manner and to the extent originally planned.

Access: Two barriers to access have contributed to the IIG's low enrollments: the need for academic upgrading and the lack of adequate financial support for students.

Financial Resources: The IIG experienced financial difficulties in its second and third years of operation, partly, from inadequate planning and financial monitoring, and partly because of insufficient funding. The IIG's funding has not adequately addressed the extra costs of providing extension and distance delivery, or the additional student supports (such as elders) needed to deliver its mandate. IIG's costs per FTE will, by necessity, be higher than the per FTE costs of mainstream post-secondary institutions, partly due to the IIG's small size, which is the result of being a specialized program targeting a specialized audience, and partly due to the extra supports needed for students to ensure their success. With the ending of the Strategic Initiatives Agreement in March 1998, the IIG will lose the federal portion of its funding. If this source of funding is not replaced, the IIG will have severe difficulties in the future in delivering its programs with the required level of student support.

Management: The IIG's management has not been effective in encouraging the confidence and support of the IIG's employees or in dealing with their concerns. It has not effectively involved employees in planning and decision making and, as a consequence, is not making the best use of its human resources. Communication between management and employees is not effective; this is a fundamental weakness and underlies other management problems.

Governance: The members of the IIG Board of Governors are not well informed about the issues facing the IIG and do not appear to be aware of the management and communication problems. The Board has not been proactive in addressing issues and has taken a passive role and let senior administrators make the decisions. Hence, the Board of Governors of the IIG has not been providing leadership or effective governance of the Institute.

Overall Conclusion

The evaluation of the IIG was done to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the IIG, and to determine how the further development of the Institute can be enhanced to ensure its success. Although this evaluation has uncovered some significant challenges for the IIG to resolve, it has also identified important strengths of the Institute. These strengths should not be overshadowed by the problems that have been detected.

A major strength of the IIG is the high degree of commitment of its administrators, instructors and non-instructional staff to the Institute's mission of *"empowering Indigenous Peoples to exercise their right of self-determination in their territories in ways which fully reflect Indigenous philosophy, values, and experience throughout the world."* They feel they are championing the cause of self-determination of Aboriginal peoples. They have high expectations of the Institute and recognize the importance of what it can achieve.

The IIG's mission is highly relevant to the Aboriginal students who are attending the IIG. The importance of the IIG to its students is reflected in the views they expressed about the IIG:

- *"It's exciting to see students learn, to enrich themselves. It's important to have the curriculum validate me...about what I went through (experiences of colonization)."*
- *"I'm more articulate, confident about my knowledge. [Education at the IIG] made me stronger in my own community."*
- *"I like the IIG 'cause of its personal feel — a community, but it still has the required academics to prepare you for careers."*
- *"I like the curriculum best...it's been an eye-opener."*
- *"I'm glad that we have such an institution to give past history and current issues...I wish there had been a school like this earlier. It's helped me with knowledge to grow and change."*
- *"The establishment of IIG by the First Nation of BC is a very positive step towards fulfillment of First Nations Canada's jurisdiction over the education of their children and people. May IIG's vision and goals be a success!"*

With their academic program, the IIG is doing pioneering work towards the realization of the mission. The commitment of the people of the IIG, their sense of purpose, and the academic program they have worked together to develop, are strengths upon which the IIG can build.

The usefulness of a formative evaluation depends on its ability to provide the IIG Board and government with information needed so that problems can be addressed. This

evaluation has identified some significant challenges for the IIG. The morale problems and communication difficulties between the senior administration and the IIG's employees are issues that only the IIG can address. The need for better planning and Board development are also areas to be addressed by the IIG. To solve the IIG's financial challenges, though, partnerships with both the provincial and federal governments will be needed. Indigenous communities also have a role to play in helping the IIG to succeed. Recommendations for resolving these problems and improving the IIG have been provided separately from this report.

The evaluation findings must be tempered by the fact that the IIG was just completing its second year of operation when this evaluation began. It is normal for a complex organization, such as a post-secondary institution, to experience problems in the early stages of its development. The IIG has the additional challenge of attempting to provide post-secondary education that reflects Indigenous values, culture and experience, and hence has not been able to rely on mainstream post-secondary institutions as models for its development.

The IIG has the necessary building blocks for success: a highly relevant mission and program, and dedicated employees and administrators who have a sense of purpose. Its problems notwithstanding, the IIG has made an impressive beginning. With the information provided in this evaluation, if utilized, the IIG will be able to build on its strengths and ensure that it has a successful future.

Management Response

Recommendation 1.1

Since one instructor can teach a number of students in one class, this may be a more cost-effective use of public funds in the long term compared to funding students to move to a central campus. Although extension programming will cost the institution more to deliver, it may reduce the overall costs when considering that most Aboriginal students are funded with public funds to attend the IIG. Students will need less money to attend a program in their own community. Extension programming also has the advantage of allowing students to remain in their home communities where they have family ties and community support. This may increase both participation and completion rates. The IIG should promote these many potential benefits of extension programming as the rationale for increasing provincial and federal funding for extension programming.

Management agrees that positive cost-benefits should play a larger role in determining the Institute's approach to extension programming. Further, Management acknowledges the Institute's commitment to its existing community partners and learners and will endeavour to meet these needs whenever possible. An integrated response to issues raised in 1.1, 1.2, & 1.3 constitutes a major component of recent program papers and funding proposals, such as, the 17 February Ministry of Advanced Education Training & Technology (MAET&T) Program Profile, the 25 February funding submission to the Minister of Indian Affairs, the 30 March Board briefing, and the 22 May presentation to regional DIAND Managers.

In sum, Management has proposed a distributed learning model. This approach broadly draws on policy initiatives within the post-secondary system[1] and on federal support for technology-based learning.[2] It brings instructors and learners together in a number of different ways and supports their activities in a systemic and co-ordinated fashion.

Management concurs that continuing on with the current model — wherein Instructors travel to satellite campuses — will pose significant institutional and learner challenges. We agree that the status quo is both cost ineffective and that it limits learner benefits. Specifically, the current model raises issues, such as:

- Sustainability: The face-to-face extension model is broadly perceived within the post-secondary system as cost-ineffective and generally has been abandoned because its proponents can not justify its use on a business case basis. Seeking additional funds for instructional delivery that largely depends on this approach will be difficult.

---

1 See, for instance: Issues and Strategic Priorities for the College, Institute and Agency System. Nov., 1997.; Access and Choice: the Future of Distributed Learning in British Columbia. May, 1997. Computer-Mediated Communications in British Columbia: Post-Secondary Plans and Resources. Feb., 1996.; Report of the Post-Secondary Forum on Distributed Learning Environments. Dec., 1995.

2 For instance, HRDC funding for video-conferencing at the IIG and Public Works Canada funding for a Native Youth Computer Camp at the Institute this summer.

- Learner Resources: Learners in extension campuses have uneven access to primary learner resources for their specialized programs of study. The UBCIC Resource Centre catalogue can only be accessed on-site. Similarly, extension students do not have off-site borrowing privileges at the UBCIC Resource Centre and satellite libraries do not possess sufficient depth or program focus.

- Learner Choices: Learners in extension sites have a limited number of course choices in their communities. This extends their total completion time. Similarly, most current course offerings are time and place dependent. Learners with family and/or work commitments are forced to juggle these responsibilities in order to participate.

- Cost: Learner/instructor ratios have to be higher in extension campuses to cover the cost of sending instructors to these sites. Travel time also raises important issues of workload.

Recommendation 1.2

The IIG recognizes that it should reconsider its distance and extension program. We recommend that they do this immediately, as it is an essential aspect of its mission and important to improving access to post-secondary education for Aboriginal people. Given that improving access is one of the goals of the Aboriginal Post-Secondary Education and Training Policy Framework, the IIG and the Field Services and Aboriginal Education Branch of the Ministry should work together to identify innovative ways to achieve this goal. A variety of options will be needed to meet the various needs of the communities throughout this province. Ways to partner with organizations, such as Community Skills Centres, and post-secondary institutions, that already have the infrastructure for remote delivery, need to be identified. Where access to such infrastructure is not available, alternatives should be explored, such as cable TV and radio.

Management has proposed a lifelong learning plan to address issues related to the quality and accessibility of instruction for off-site learners. Central to this planning model has been the development of system-wide linkages with Ministry organizations such as the Centre for Curriculum, Transfer and Technology (C2T2), the Centre for Education Information Standards and Services (CEISS), and the British Columbia Council on Admissions and Transfer (BCCAT). These partners have provided support and planning expertise to connect the IIG with system-wide services, such as, the Provincial Learning Network (PLN), Post-Secondary Application Service of BC (PASBC), EXPLORE (a web-based electronic resource of IIG programs), and the Electronic Library Network (ELN), and to ensure that IIG course credits are fully transferable within the BC post-secondary environment.

Similarly, the Institute has developed links with other stakeholders with the aim of enhancing existing learner infrastructure. This experience has been good and bad. For example, the Institute partnered during the Fall semester with Lillooet Secondary School to deliver the IGST 109 computer course. The Secondary School made their 25-workstation pentium lab available to the Institute at no cost. They viewed their

contribution, as part of their laddering commitment for First Nations. A request to use a 15-workstation computer lab in Duncan, however, was seen as a revenue opportunity. Malaspina College proposed a rate of $100.00/hour — $3,900 for the run of the course — and justified it as cost-recovery.

Management generally supports the use of new technologies to overcome access barriers. We have developed a plan to use video-conferencing to provide direct instruction and learner support. Community Skills Centres are a key element in delivering this mode of instruction as are the 112 college campuses spread across British Columbia. Management has had on-going discussions concerning distributed learning with representatives from Community Skills Centres and other Colleges in BC. Management has also invested in piloting Internet based instruction, and examined the feasibility of using Aboriginal radio networks in British Columbia and the Yukon to deliver IIG courses. Management considers that the delivery emphasis must be balanced. A simultaneous development of distributed learner supports and resources are necessary to utilize system infrastructure. Specifically, effective delivery requires the design and implementation of appropriate internal administrative systems, instructional support, and technical expertise necessary to adequately serve off-site learners.

Recommendation 1.3

The extension program should be delivered in partnership with others. The IIG cannot deliver this on its own due to the costs involved. In addition to the above steps, the IIG should actively seek out partnerships with Aboriginal communities. These communities should be willing to provide support to the IIG in delivering the program, for the benefit, in turn of the IIG providing people in their community with access to post-secondary education without needing to leave their community. Such support could come in the form of providing free use of facilities for the delivery of instruction, or community elders to provide guidance and support to students.

Management supports the recommendation that the Institute employ various modes of delivery and engage new points of access. Board approval of the distributed learning strategy will provide a basis for discussing potential delivery and support relationships with system partners such as First Nations, Community Skills Centres, and other post-secondary institutions; specifically, University College of the Cariboo and Camosun College which each operate extension campuses in communities where the IIG has delivered on-site courses.

To date, Extension services has developed agreements on a bilateral basis: between the IIG and the Saanich Indian School Board, and the Lillooet Tribal Council. IIG management sees the need to develop a more comprehensive strategy that involves working with the political leadership and management in First Nations communities to obtain the required funding to finance partnerships. Often we find that there are insufficient resources to carry out plans at the local level. The suggestions for partnership in this recommendation represent a good starting point.

Recommendation 1.4

The IIG should apply for funding for Aboriginal education co-ordinators from the Field Services and Aboriginal Education Branch, to provide a linkage between the IIG and its extension sites. Since the IIG's audience is spread across the entire province, it will need more than one co-ordinator to fill this role effectively. The co-ordinators would provide an important communication link with the IIG main campus, and would be actively involved in recruitment activities both for the extension and main program.

The Institute has, as part of its Program Profile submission, approached MAET&T for three Aboriginal Liaison co-ordinators. As per our funding letter, the Ministry has stated that the $1.4 million dollar operating envelope was intended to cover any additional costs associated with Aboriginal co-ordinators and student development.

Recommendation 1.5

The Institute should refine and articulate a formal recruitment strategy complete with recruitment activities. Short and long term issues regarding access barriers, delivery of extension programming and distance education, bridging and laddering efforts, allocated funding, partnerships and shared resources with other public and Aboriginal agencies, etc., need to be addressed in terms of an overall recruitment strategy. This strategy should include responsibilities, goals and timelines and be linked to the overall strategic plan for the IIG.

The Institute has begun to refocus its recruitment activity. With the redevelopment and re-organization of the IIG, there is a need for continual updating of strategies as new opportunities develop. Fundamental to this approach is the integration of admission and recruitment objectives and the design and implementation of a needs assessment tool for prioritizing recruitment activities. Management sees the Education Council playing an important role in this process. In the interim, we have tried, subject to financial limitations, to conduct recruitment activity within the secondary school system as well as targeting related events such as career fairs and other school activities. The Institute has allocated up to $8,000 for recruitment during the 1997/98 fiscal year. In addition, the Institute is planning to target transition funds to enable delivery of IIG introductory courses for secondary school learners. This will facilitate educational laddering, an increasingly important objective for the Institute and MAET&T.

Recommendation 1.6

Insufficient student funding is a barrier to access for Aboriginal students. Due to the disadvantages they have faced in the past, they have additional challenges that a non-Aboriginal student would not have. Because of the considerably higher likelihood of not completing education programs at traditional post-secondary institutions, Aboriginal students will tend to need more time to complete their post-secondary training. They may exceed the number of years that band funding is available. There are other criteria in band funding that can pose problems; these vary by band, since bands can set their own guidelines. Student loans are not always a solution for Aboriginal students. Because of the

tendency to not complete prior programs, they may be more likely to default on a student loan than would be non-Aboriginal students, given their higher unemployment rate. The high unemployment rate may also make some students reluctant to take a loan for fear they will not be able to repay it later. These are systemic barriers that are beyond the IIG's control, yet if students do not have funds to go to the IIG, the IIG will not succeed.

Given the barrier to access lack of funding causes, we recommend that the federal and provincial governments examine the funding issue for Aboriginal students in general to determine the extent of the problem and implement changes to funding to ensure that lack of funding is not a barrier to access. We also encourage the federal and provincial governments to work together with Aboriginal stakeholders to establish the Provincial Aboriginal Post-Secondary Education Endowment Fund, so that access to post-secondary education for Aboriginal people is improved.

Management agrees that the system barriers to accessibility and funding are beyond the Institute's control. As per our Program Profile, the Institute has advocated that the provincial and federal governments commence discussions with the IIG and NVIT to bring the Education Endowment to realization by the 1999/2000 academic year. The majority of band funding from the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (DIAND) is in the form of Contribution Agreements. Post-secondary education is funded on a per capita equity distribution formula that allocates funds based on the proportion of registered band members in the age range 18-34 years old compared to the total registered Indigenous population in BC.[3] The support levels for post-secondary education are largely fixed amounts determined by DIAND as above, rather than actual demand and need. Without changes to the equity distribution formula and additional increased support from all levels of government, accessibility and funding barriers for First Nation's students will not be eliminated.

Recommendation 2.1

The IIG should improve its financial planning capacity. Improving the financial record and reporting systems is part of this. Financial planning should be linked to strategic planning, such that budget commitments are tied into operational plans and are long term in scope. Plans should clearly identify the potential impact, both in the short term and the long term, for each aspect of the plan.

Management agrees that financial planning should be linked to strategic planning and that long term goals need to be considered along side short term action plans. The Institute must also factor into this process the general economic circumstance of government, students, and First Nation's communities. The comprehensive funding proposals submitted to the provincial and federal governments represent a baseline for redeveloping the organizational plan that brought the IIG into existence. Strategic planning initiatives proposed for the Fall of 1998 would clearly link annual financial planning to long term implementation and evaluation.

---

[3] Matthew, Nathan. 1996. First Nations Education Finances: A Review.

Before an organization can plan, it is essential that the system of financial record produce reliable, timely and meaningful information. Financial record and reporting systems have improved significantly under the present administration. Steps are being taken to continually upgrade these capabilities in keeping with resource levels (see Appendix A).

Recommendation 2.2

In implementing the Basic Operating Grant Envelope, the Ministry should take into consideration the unique characteristics of the IIG to ensure that its funding is appropriate. The Ministry should recognize that, since the IIG provides a specialized program targeting a specialized audience, it will likely always have a higher per FTE cost compared to more general post-secondary institutions. The Ministry's funding mechanism for the IIG should take into account the following requirements of the IIG:

- student supports not typically found at traditional institutions, such as:
  - — resident elders to bring Indigenous philosophy and cultural values into the institution;
  - — counsellors for support to students in coping with traumatic effects of being of a marginalized group; and
  - — academic support programs to address the students' academic weaknesses that are the result of ineffective mainstream educational experiences.
- library resources that deal with Indigenous government issues, as well as usual library resources found a post-secondary institutions; and
- programming delivered in communities throughout British Columbia as well as student supports and library resources for extension.

We agree that the Ministry should take into account the unique characteristics of the IIG to ensure that it's funding is appropriate to meet both the uniqueness of a developing Aboriginal post-secondary institution and additional monies for student support and library resources for all academic programs. The Program Profile process clearly identified additional financial resources required for:

- Elders Teaching, Training & Documentation Program; and
- Student Development & Support Services.

Although the Ministry increased the operating envelope in 1998/1999 by 49%, additional monies were not provided for the Elders program or for Student development and support services.

Currently the IIG is experiencing dis-economies of scale in the provision of library services. Approximately $145,000 or 7.25% of our annual budget is allocated to the provision of these library services, as compared to a lower percentage across the

provincial system. The solution for additional library support must come in the form economic partnerships with external funding partners (public or private) who have a vested interest in jointly pursuing the Mission of the IIG as it relates to library resources specific to Indigenous Government issues. For off-site learners there is a critical need to integrate the UBCIC Resource Centre with the public post-secondary system and to begin the work of making key documents and archives more readily available through the use of distributed educational technologies.

Recommendation 2.3

The Ministry should improve communication and provide more assistance to the IIG with respect to identifying sources of provincial funding that the IIG could pursue.

The IIG has been pro-active in improving communications. In November 1997 the administration of the IIG met with the Deputy Minister, Don Avison, and Assistant Deputy Minister, Shell Harvey, to orient them to the objectives and work of the Institute, reach consensus for principles of funding and set the stage for future communications with Ministry officials. As a result in January of 1998 the Institute organized a Ministry-wide orientation in Victoria to further increase awareness and communication. Consequently, working relationships between the Institute and Ministry personnel and agencies have been broadly supported. In addition, the Institute presented its Program Profile to the Ministry for the first time. The preparation of a well documented Program Profile submission, resulted in a substantial increase to our 1998-1999 operating grant.

Management has also set up a June meeting with the Minister and Deputy Minister of Advanced Education Training & Technology to discuss ways and means to support the Institute and its Mission with other provincial and federal partners.

Recommendation 2.4

The IIG should seek out additional sources of operational funding. This should include applying for funding that is available through the Field Services and Aboriginal Education Branch to the Ministry. Funding needs, and their rationale pertaining to extension, recruitment and access have been outlined in section 1.

The provincial operating envelope is inclusive of all available sources of funding within the Ministry. This envelope includes funding available through Field Services and Aboriginal Services. Other smaller envelopes such as PLN, Prior Learning Assessment (PLA), and work-study may result in modest gains for the Institute.

Recommendation 2.5

The IIG should work to identify other federal funding that may be available to the IIG. One of the rationales for federal funding is provided in recommendation 1.1, with respect to extension programming.

The Institute has applied initially to the Department of Indian Affairs, and will approach other federal departments, such as, Human Resources Development Canada, Industry

Canada, Health Canada, and Justice for additional funding. There is a specific rationale for targeting the Department of Indian Affairs. This is centred on the fact that Indian Affairs is the lead Department in articulating the Federal government's response to the Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP). The submission to the Department emphasizes the role that the Institute can play as a national organization with a priority being "capacity-building" within First Nation's communities. Our 19 May meeting with Regional Director, John Watson, identified internal DIAND funding issues and provoked extensive positive discussions relating to the IIG's distributed learning strategy.

Recommendation 2.6

The IIG should also work with other Aboriginal post-secondary and political organizations to lobby the federal government for an increase in Indian Student Support Program (ISSP) funds, using recommendations of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal People as one of the rationales for the need to increase funding.

Management agrees that there is a need to increase Institute contributions from the Indian Student Support Program (ISSP). Management made this case in a 9 January 1998 proposal to ISSP. The Department rejected this proposal. The Department of Indian Affairs has set up a partnering process with the Assembly of First Nations regarding initiatives related to the Royal Commission response. What has resulted, as with any centrally controlled process, is a delay in implementing all new initiatives. The IIG has enlisted the personal support of the National Chief to further its goals with regard to obtaining Federal funding.

To this end we are also soliciting the support of Honourable Andrew Petter, Minister of Advanced Education & Intergovernmental Affairs, to intervene on behalf of the IIG. Political support will also be sought from First Nation's communities, UBCIC, and other organizations. We have also established a strategic relationship with the Administration of the Nicola Valley Institute of Technology in order to promote issues of common concern.

At its May meeting, the Joint Council of the Advanced Education Council of British Columbia (AECBC) endorsed a resolution brought forward by the IIG and NVIT to increase funding for Aboriginal programming in British Columbia.

Recommendation 2.7

The IIG should raise private funds by developing and implementing a fundraising program and by encouraging partnerships, endorsements and sponsorships of the IIG from Aboriginal communities.

Management recognizes the specialized and complex nature of fundraising as well the importance of communicating a credible need to private and public sector funding bodies. In November of last year, Senior IIG management attended a half-day development workshop facilitated by Pam Miles, Director of UBC's University Endowment. Since then, management has worked to develop a profile that identifies specific projects and

program areas where philanthropic support can be applied. For instance, the Institute approached both West Coast Energy and BC Hydro, in early 1998, with proposals to support specific IIG initiatives. In January, West Coast Energy was briefed about funding support for library services, the student computing lab, and initiatives planned as part of the Lifelong Learning Centre. In February, BC Hydro expressed interest in the Institute's Elder's Training and Documentation Program. This Spring, preliminary discussions have taken place with national trade unions concerning the availability of project-based support. Each experience has emphasized the importance of networking among private and public donors and highlighted the contributions that a Development Office could bring to the Institute's overall fundraising efforts.

Recommendation 3.1

The IIG has spent considerable effort in improving its record keeping and reporting process. The IIG is required to be ready to start reporting to the Ministry in 1997/98 fiscal year. More work needs to be done to ensure that the IIG can meet all reporting requirements for both management and accountability purposes.

As mentioned in 2.1 and referenced in Appendix A, Management has made changes to the current financial reporting and monitoring system. These enhancements will enable Management to prepare the following reports as part of the Ministry's accountability structure:

Financial

- Audited Financial Statements (September 1998);
- Public Bodies Report (September 1998);
- Annual Report (October 1998); and
- Federal/Provincial Agreement Forms (Vocational Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons).

Non-Financial

- Audited Actual FTE Report (September 1998); and
- Key Performance Indicators (September 1998).

Recommendation 3.2

Since the IIG is in its development phase, it does not need to carry out program review and institutional self-study at this stage. However, there are benefits to any institution for putting an institutional evaluation process into place early, particularly given the challenges the IIG is facing. Developing an effective review process now will be useful for program and institutional planning and ongoing improvement as the IIG programs evolve and develop. It is also a process for seeking meaningful input from employees into the planning process.

IIG Management agrees that an effective program review is a necessary component of the strategic planning process.

Recommendation 3.3

The summative evaluation that is required within two years of the end of the Strategic Initiatives Agreement should, in addition to addressing the outcome issues identified in the evaluation framework for the IIG, also address the issues where significant problems were identified in the formative evaluation, including financial resources, access, management effectiveness, communication, partnerships, and governance.

Management agrees that a summative evaluation should provide a comprehensive view of institutional performance. Developing the terms of reference for any future evaluation will require input and consensus of all parties as they understand the original framework agreement. It is management's view that this entails a negotiation of interests and concerns on a range of issues.

Recommendation 4.1

The Education Council is one example of a process of broadening the decision-making processes of the IIG. The education council also plays an important role in institutional self-evaluation, and hence should be implemented with that in mind. The education council has become an example to IIG employees of the reluctance of management to seek input into decision-making. The administration should make the establishment of the council a high priority and ensure that a council is in place before the end of the 1997/98 academic year, as one step in demonstrating the willingness of management to allow IIG employees to be included in decision-making. Such a step should also help in improving morale.

A structure for the IIG Education Council was developed in a consultation between the Academic Dean and the full-time faculty. Elections for the IIG Education Council were held on 30 March and the Council has met several times since that date. On 19 May an academic administrator was appointed. Management has no doubt that the Education Council has an important role to play in the development of education program policy and planning.

Recommendation 4.2

The IIG should put other processes in place, as appropriate, that will allow instructors and staff to be included in planning and decision-making in appropriate and meaningful ways. These processes should be designed to empower employees and improve communication.

Management agrees that improved communication is important to institutional well being. In addition to the Education Council, Management considers that the collective bargaining process will regularize communication between staff and administrators and provide a forum for discussing and resolving work-related issues. Management will continue to solicit input from staff on issues such as budget review, program and project priorities, and institutional change as they relate to the strategic planning process.

Recommendation 4.3

The IIG should establish communication protocols and processes that ensure open and direct communication to all staff and the Board. Processes should encourage input and feedback from staff and faculty and be consistent with indigenous values. Decisions should be communicated in writing, with rationale for the decision.

Management agrees that communicating decisions in writing complete with a rationale is a good practice. Since the IIG is made up of individuals from various Nations, Indigenous values must be articulated and envisioned in a consensus-building exercise, the end result being a shared sense of core institutional values. Elders will play a fundamental role in guiding the consensus-building process. Management accepts the responsibility of establishing and maintaining good communication. The challenge for the IIG is for all parties to demonstrate how indigenous values and practices can guide operations.

Recommendation 4.4

The IIG should carry out activities to raise the profile of the Institute with Aboriginal communities throughout BC, secondary and post-secondary institutions and relevant departments and branches of the federal and provincial governments. The work to raise the profile of the IIG and encourage the support of Aboriginal communities should involve the President, as well as the extension co-ordinators and other staff.

Management has placed the emphasis on student recruitment activity in our visits to Aboriginal Communities and secondary schools. The Academic calendar has been reformatted for community, agency, and student use. IIG personnel, Board members and student representatives have raised the awareness of and support for IIG during recent meetings with Provincial and Federal officials. Some fifty officials — including the ADM — of the Advanced Education Ministry attended a January information session. All constituencies within the IIG have played a role to raise the profile of the Institute. Management expects this practice to continue.

Recommendation 4.5

The IIG should work to establish partnerships with Aboriginal organizations and post-secondary institutions wherever feasible. Such partnerships should be formalized and benefits, expectations, goals, and roles and responsibilities should be specified for all partners involved. Partnerships can pertain to the delivery of instruction, or to sharing expertise, or to any other endeavour that will be mutually beneficial to the IIG and its partners.

Management concurs that partnership is a cornerstone of future institutional growth. The early development of the Institute has so far emphasized internal priorities. Management expects partnership to play a greater role now that the Institute has established credibility as an educational provider. During the past year, numerous projects have been carried forward with Ministry partners. This summer, the Institute will begin negotiations with Langara College to examine potential partnerships in conjunction with their First Nations

program. Further, management expects that longstanding partnerships with Aboriginal organizations, such as the Native Education Centre and NVIT will grow and develop. Management welcomes Board input regarding strategic partnerships with Aboriginal organizations that will positively benefit the Institute and its student body.

Recommendation 5.1

The IIG should develop complete written policies and procedures, in consultation with staff and faculty. Changes in policies and/or procedures should also be developed in consultation and should be clearly communicated in a timely fashion to all concerned. The IIG should also ensure that roles and responsibilities of all administrators, staff and faculty are clearly defined and communicated.

A draft policy and procedure framework has been compiled. During the summer of 1998, management will revisit critical areas within the policy framework and encourage a consultative process in their development. Personnel policies and procedures will be addressed through the collective bargaining process. In addition, educational policies and procedures will be developed in conjunction with the Education Council. When complete, the comprehensive manual will be made available to all staff and students via the local area network.

Recommendation 5.2

Board development should be a priority. This includes:

- *providing workshops for the entire Board, designed specifically for the IIG;*
- *developing terms of reference for the Board and all its committees, with clear definitions of roles and responsibilities;*
- *establishing appropriate committees to effectively deal with the business of the Board and ensuring that these committees function effectively;*
- *developing a pro-active style for the operation of the Board and its committee, including setting agendas and following up on issues from previous meetings until resolved;*
- *ensuring that quorum is achieved and that members attend on a regular basis;*
- *ensuring that the Board is provided with appropriate information with sufficient time to be read before meetings; and*
- *restructuring meetings to focus on making decisions rather than accepting activity reports and adopting recommendations.*

Management is committed to working with the Board in identifying its priorities as part of the strategic plan.

Recommendation 5.3

The Board should take action immediately to fill the position of permanent President of the IIG.

Management agrees.

Recommendation 5.4

The Board should ensure that a comprehensive strategic plan for the IIG is developed in consultation with employees. Outside expertise should be sought to facilitate the process. The strategic plan should deal with all aspects of the operations of the IIG, and effectively link financial planning with facilities, capital, academic and extension planning.

Management agrees the Board should ensure that a comprehensive strategic plan is developed for the IIG in consultation with all constituencies. Through the comprehensive funding submissions discussed and approved by the Board, management laid the groundwork for a strategic plan. Management is prepared to work with the Board, staff, and facilitators drawn from within the Colleges and Institutes system to revisit this plan and develop and implement a comprehensive strategic plan. This strategic plan should be guided by Elders and must link operational goal setting and multi-year financial planning to specific time frames.

1. Introduction

1.1 Overview of the Institute of Indigenous Government

The Institute of Indigenous Government (IIG) is Canada's first autonomous, degree-granting Indigenous-controlled, public post-secondary institution. It was designated as a provincial institute under the British Columbia's College and Institute Act in 1995. The IIG is the result of the efforts of the Union of BC Indian Chiefs (UBCIC[4]), which identified a "great need for a post-secondary education that reflects Indigenous philosophy, cultural values and social experience, and for a post-secondary institution that provides a curriculum which prepares students for leadership roles in Indigenous government settings."[5]

The Union was directed to proceed with planning for the IIG by a resolution of the 23rd Annual Assembly of the UBCIC, in October 1991. On June 11, 1993, the UBCIC and the BC Government established a Joint Policy Council for the development of the IIG as a degree-granting, Indigenous-controlled post-secondary institution. This lead to the development of a proposal and planning document for the IIG, jointly developed by the UBCIC and the Ministry of Skills, Training and Labour (MoSTL), which was finalized on March 3, 1995. This document guides the development of the IIG and is based on the recognition of the need for culturally appropriate post-secondary education for Indigenous people, which cannot be solely met within the existing "mainstream" post-secondary infrastructure.

The mission of the Institute of Indigenous Government is "to provide an accredited specialized program of post-secondary education, skills-training and research opportunities dedicated to empowering Indigenous Peoples to exercise their right of self-determination in their territories in ways which fully reflect Indigenous philosophy, values, and experience throughout the world."[6]

IIG began offering courses in the Fall of 1995. The Institute offers a two-year program of courses leading to an Associate of Arts Degree in Indigenous Government Studies, as well as a one-year certificate program. The IIG plans to offer a four-year program of courses leading to a Baccalaureate in Indigenous Government Studies by the 1999/2000 academic year. Instruction is delivered on the IIG's main campus in downtown Vancouver. In addition, IIG courses have been offered at two extension sites, in Saanich and Lillooet.

---

4 The Union of BC Indian Chiefs is also referred to as the Union in this report.

5 *Institute of Indigenous Government: Proposal and Planning Paper*, Union of BC Indian Chiefs, March 1995, page 3.

6 From the *Institute of Indigenous Government: Proposal and Planning Paper*, March 1995.

1.2 Funding for the Institute of Indigenous Government

Funding for the establishment and development of the IIG has been provided, in part, through the Strategic Initiatives (SI) Agreement between the Province of BC and the government of Canada. This Agreement provided for matching contributions from the provincial and federal governments for the first three years, from 1995/96 to 1997/98, totalling $4.98 million. In the Provincial Agreement with the IIG, the province also agreed to provide funding for the IIG until 2000. The federal and provincial contributions to the IIG are set out in Table 1-1. Each government provided a total of $2.49 million over the three year period of the Strategic Initiatives Agreement.

TABLE 1-1
Federal and Provincial Funding for the IIG

Year	Funding
1995/96	Provincial: $700,000 • $350,000 in start-up funds • $200,000 for the delivery of 30 full-time equivalent (FTE) student spaces • $150,000 for leasing facilities and associated costs Federal: $538,050 Total: $1,238,050
1996/97	Provincial: $850,000 • $200,000 in continuation of start up funds • $200,000 for the delivery of 30 FTE student spaces • $200,000 for the continuation of those FTEs into year 2 studies • $200,000 for the introduction of an additional class of 30 FTEs • $50,000 for leasing facilities and associated costs Federal: $1,000,000 Total: $1,850,000
1997/98	Provincial: $940,000 • $100,000 in continuation of start up funds • funding for 140 FTEs based on a funding formula of $6,000 per FTE Federal: $951,950 Total: $1,891,950
1998/99	Provincial: • funding as provided to other post-secondary institutions under the Act.
1999/2000	Provincial: • funding as provided to other post-secondary institutions under the Act.

The other sources of funding for the IIG are student fees and donations through fundraising activities. Student's fees are $300 for a three-credit course and $400 for a four-credit course. Fund raising efforts are intended to supplement other sources of funding, particularly for support for students and capital costs.

1.3 Strategic Initiatives Objectives for the IIG

According to the SI Agreement, the IIG will seek to address the specific needs of Aboriginal students in meeting the two key objectives of:

- significantly reducing the attrition rates of Aboriginal students in post-secondary studies; and

- enhancing their success in finding work upon graduation.

The Agreement specified that the IIG will work to achieve these objectives by:

- establishing a supportive learning environment, including a resident elder and student counsellor;

- ensuring that course content is relevant to the Aboriginal experience;

- while ensuring that the education and labour market training are related to Indigenous self-government issues, course content will include transferable skills and knowledge, such as:

  — financial management and fiscal accountability;
  — community planning and development;
  — personnel administration; and
  — public and media relations.

- partnering with the Open Learning Agency to develop and implement an extension program which will allow up to 80% of IIG students to pursue their studies in regional centres and First Nations communities; and

- entering into an agreement on "joint credentials" with the Open Learning Agency, such that all IIG course credits earned by students are also recognized as Open University credits and can be transferred to other universities in BC and elsewhere, that have credit-transfer arrangements with the OLA.

Further information on the IIG can be found in the evaluation framework that was developed during the first phase of the evaluation.[7]

1.4 Purpose of the Evaluation

Evaluation of the IIG is a requirement of the Strategic Initiatives Agreement. The evaluation is overseen by a committee consisting of representatives of the Institute of Indigenous Government, the Union of BC Indian Chiefs; the Ministry of Education, Skills and Training (MoEST); and Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC). The first

---

7 *Evaluation, Monitoring* and *Reporting Framework for the Institute of Indigenous Government Strategic Initiatives*, January 1997.

phase in evaluating the IIG, an evaluation framework, was completed in January of 1997, by L. McElroy & Associates. This, the formative evaluation of the IIG, is the second phase in the evaluation of the IIG. A summative evaluation is required within two years of the end of the Strategic Initiative Agreement.

The main objective of the formative evaluation is to ensure that there are effective processes in place and that there are no impediments to the success of the IIG. In particular, the evaluation addresses issues pertaining to:

- the relevance of the design of the IIG;
- the effectiveness and efficiency of its implementation;
- delivery and management processes and how these processes can be improved;
- the appropriateness of monitoring, evaluation and reporting processes for the IIG;
- the effectiveness of recruitment and enrollment procedures; and
- the extent to which barriers to access exist and how these can be overcome.

The specific issues addressed in the evaluation are provided in Appendix A of the Research Plan.[8]

1.5 Evaluation Methodology

Three primary methods of data collection were used for the evaluation: interviews, focus groups and review of documents. In addition, all current students were invited to complete a brief survey to supplement the information collected in the focus groups. The data collection components are described below. Appendix B contains a listing of all interviewees for each interview component. Further details of the methodology, and the data collection instruments, can be found in the Research Plan.

- **IIG Staff:** This group includes all staff at IIG, including the President, the Bursar, the Academic Dean, the Registrar, Director of Extension, Director of the International program, elders, counsellors, faculty, sessional instructors and non-instructional staff. All current and former members of the IIG administration who are still employed at the IIG were asked questions pertaining to a wide range of issues, including the administration of the IIG. Non-instructional staff were asked questions relevant to their involvement with the IIG. Where necessary, interview guides were tailored to the individual respondent. A total of 20 employees and administrators were interviewed, almost all in person, including all administrators, all faculty, some sessional instructors, and a selection of elders, and non-instructional staff.

---

8 *Research Plan for the Formative Evaluation of the Institute of Indigenous Government*, July 1997.

- **IIG Board of Governors and the Union of BC Indian Chiefs:** For the purposes of this evaluation we have combined these two groups, since there is some overlap in membership, as a number of the members of the Board also sit on the UBCIC's Chiefs' Council, or have sat on the Council in the past. Seven people were interviewed in this group. Most interviews were conducted by telephone, as these people live throughout British Columbia. Union representatives who are not also on the IIG Board were asked a subset of the questions asked of Board members.

- **IIG Students:** Focus groups were conducted with groups of current IIG students, both at the main campus and at the two extension sites. All IIG students were sent a letter from the President of the IIG, describing the purpose of the evaluation and inviting them to participate. They were asked to sign and return an enclosed permission form if they were willing to have IIG release their name to the evaluators. Those students who returned signed release forms were contacted by one of the evaluators and invited to participate in a focus group held on their campus.

  Since it is possible that the students who volunteered to participate in focus groups were not representative of the entire IIG student population, all students were given an opportunity to complete a brief survey, where they could provide ratings on a number of aspects of their experience at the IIG. Students were also invited to add written comments if they wished. Students who participated in the focus group were given the survey form at the beginning of the session and other students were given the form during a regular IIG class. Students in the focus groups completed the survey and returned it to the evaluator before the focus group discussion began. Students who were not in a focus group submitted their completed surveys to IIG in sealed envelopes, to be forwarded to the evaluators. The number of students who participated in the focus groups, or completed a survey only, is provided in Table 1-2.

  Former students were also sent letters and invited to participate, but only a few returned permission forms. In many cases, the letter to the former student was returned to the IIG because the person had moved. A member of the IIG faculty tried to contact former students by telephone who had not returned permission forms, to obtain their permission to release their names to the evaluators. In total, 5 former students and one person who had been accepted but did not attend the IIG were interviewed by telephone.

TABLE 1-2
Student Participation in the Evaluation
(% of population in parenthesis)

	Vancouver	Saanich	Lillooet	Overall
Participated in Focus Group	21 (28%)	5 (24%)	2 (11%)	28 (24%)
Completed Survey only	14 (19%)	6 (29%)	6 (32%)	26 (23%)
Total	35 (45%)	11 (52%)	8 (42%)	54 (47%)

- **Participating Aboriginal Communities:** Focus groups were conducted in each of the two communities that have participated in the IIG extension program, Saanich and Lillooet. Key members of these communities with knowledge of the IIG extension program and the post-secondary education needs of their communities participated in the focus groups.

- **Selected Non-participating Aboriginal Communities:** Focus groups were conducted in two different Aboriginal communities that had not had any IIG extension program in their community. One community, Cowichan, has been in discussion with IIG regarding the possible delivery of the IIG extension program in their community. The other community, Penticton, has not had discussions with IIG. The Penticton Band is a member of the Union while the Cowichan Band is not. Focus groups included community representatives with knowledge of the post-secondary education needs of their communities and, where possible, potential students.

- **External Stakeholders:** For the purposes of this evaluation, the term *"external stakeholder"* refers to organizations and agencies that have a stake or interest in the IIG and are not included in any of the above groups. This includes both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal post-secondary organizations in BC, as well as relevant provincial and federal governments. Fourteen people were interviewed for this component, some in person and some by telephone.

- **Documents and Records:** A variety of documents and records were reviewed for this evaluation, including:

  — the original proposal and planning paper for the IIG, of March 1995;

  — minutes of the meetings of the IIG Board of Governors, except for meetings held in-camera;

  — IIG documents and reports, including financial plans and program plans and *Personnel Evaluation: a process for motivation and human development, Draft*, June '96;

  — IIG admission, retention and completion records for both the main and extension campuses;

  — current IIG recruitment materials;

  — the agreements between the IIG and the provincial and federal governments;

  — HRDC's *Aboriginal Bilateral Agreements* dated May 23, 1997 and the *Regional Bilateral Agreement* dated January 23, 1996;

  — the Ministry of Education, Skills and Training's *Aboriginal Post-Secondary Education and Training Policy Framework*, and the *1997 KPI Data Manual: British Columbia College, Institute and Agency System*; and

— *The College and Institute Act* of 1989 and the *College and Institute Amendment Act* of 1994.

Data collection was carried out from the middle of August 1997 until late November 1997. During this period, the IIG has not remained static; as is normal for any organization, especially in its development phase, the IIG has continued to evolve. To ensure that the evaluation was based on the most recent information available, brief follow-up interviews were also conducted with some of the IIG and government interviewees on issues that arose during interviews or issues where the information was changing during the course of the evaluation.

1.6 Limitations of the Methodology

The participating Aboriginal communities component only partially addresses the issue of relevance to Aboriginal communities. This component provides information on the relevance of the IIG's mission and programs only to these two communities, Saanich and Lillooet. It also provides information pertaining to the issues of recruitment and access, from the perspective of these two communities.

Two non-participating Aboriginal communities were included to provide perspectives from some communities that had not had an IIG extension program. This was done to broaden our understanding of the needs of Aboriginal communities as they pertain to post-secondary education, and the challenges they face in meeting these needs. It is important to realize that results from these two communities cannot be generalized to all Aboriginal communities in British Columbia, since these 2 communities cannot be assumed to be representative of all Aboriginal communities in British Columbia, with respect to their post-secondary education needs.

In order to generalize findings on these issues to Aboriginal communities in BC, we would need to systematically collect information from other Aboriginal communities. For this research, all Aboriginal communities in BC would need to be identified and information collected from a representative sample of these communities. With this type of research component, it would be possible to determine the level of awareness and understanding of IIG's mission and programs that exists among communities who have not yet participated. It would determine how relevant the IIG's programs are to the post-secondary educational needs of these communities.

The approach actually used in this evaluation does not provide information on how well IIG has raised interest and awareness of its programs in Aboriginal communities throughout BC. Nor does it provide information on whether barriers to access exist in these communities. It was determined that the broad issue of relevance was beyond the scope of this evaluation as it would exceed the time and budget available for the research.

1.7 Organization of the Report

The evaluation findings are presented in the following chapters:

2. Implementation: including status of the implementation of the IIG, enrollments and a profile of IIG students, relevance of the IIG's program to Aboriginal students and communities, recruitment effectiveness and access issues.

3. Operations: including assessment of physical and financial resources, and reporting, monitoring and evaluation procedures.

4. Management Direction: covering management effectiveness, assessment of communication and partnering, and effectiveness of IIG's governance.

The findings in each chapter are organized by evaluation issue. Each section begins with a brief statement of the issue being addressed. The complete wording of the issue is provided in the Research Plan, and the specific issue is referenced in a footnote. The issue is followed by information about the context pertaining to the issue, then the respondents' views as they relate to the issue are summarized, followed by conclusions.

A summary of the findings and conclusions is provided in the final chapter. Recommendations are provided under separate cover.

1.8 Caution About Interpretation

This is a formative evaluation of a post-secondary institution. Such close scrutiny of an educational institution while still in its formative stage is unique. The evaluation is a requirement of the Strategic Initiative funding; institutions with normal Ministry[9] funding, are not required to carry out formative evaluations of this type. Instead, colleges and institutes are required to carry out institutional self-study, which is expected to be done every five years. (Additional information on the reporting and evaluation requirements of institutes is provided in Chapter 3.)

The evaluation of the IIG was done with the purpose of identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the IIG, and determining how the further development of the Institute can be enhanced. It is a method of obtaining systematic feedback to identify where improvements are needed, and suggestions for how these improvements can be made. The evaluation is, therefore, an important tool in the IIG's formative development.

The findings from this evaluation must be tempered by the fact that the IIG was just completing its second year of operation when this evaluation began. At the time of the writing of this report, the IIG was at the halfway point of its five-year development process. We should expect, therefore, that there are areas of weaknesses and areas where improvements are needed. This is only normal at this stage in the development of such a

[9] The term "the Ministry" is used throughout this report to refer to the British Columbia Ministry of Education, Skills and Training.

complex entity as a post-secondary institution. Further, IIG is unique in that it is attempting to provide post-secondary education that reflects Indigenous values, culture and experience, and hence can only partially rely on mainstream post-secondary institutions as models for its development.

Although this evaluation has identified the strengths of the IIG, it has also identified its weaknesses. It is normal for an evaluation to focus more on weaknesses, in order to understand the reasons for them and how they can be overcome. It is not appropriate, however, to attribute the weaknesses identified through an evaluation to specific individuals involved in the program. This is a *program* evaluation, *not* a personnel evaluation. The personnel involved in the IIG have not been evaluated; the focus of study has been the Institute itself. Therefore, it is not appropriate to draw conclusions about the capabilities of the individuals involved in delivering the mandate of the Institute based on the findings or conclusions reported in this evaluation.

2. Implementation

This chapter presents findings on the relevance of the IIG program to its students and to Aboriginal communities in BC, the status of the IIG's implementation, including its enrollments, as well as findings pertaining to recruitment and access issues.

2.1 Relevance

Issue: ***Is there a clear understanding of the Mission of IIG by stakeholders? Are the programs and other services offered by the IIG relevant to the needs of Aboriginal communities in BC with respect to post-secondary education?***[10]

As stated in Chapter 1, the Mission of the Institute of Indigenous Government is *"to provide an accredited specialized program of post-secondary education, skills-training and research opportunities dedicated to empowering Indigenous Peoples to exercise their right of self-determination in their territories in ways which fully reflect Indigenous philosophy, values, and experience throughout the world."*

The IIG will achieve its mission by:

- *implementing the principle of Indigenous control of Indigenous education at the post-secondary level;*
- *ensuring that the political legacy of the founders of the Union of BC Indian Chiefs, as set out in the UBCIC's Aboriginal Title and Rights Paper, is transmitted to present and future generations;*
- *providing centralized and community-based and delivered, credit and non-credit instructional programs in Indigenous Government studies;*
- *granting certificates, an associate degree in Indigenous Government Studies and a baccalaureate degree in Indigenous Government Studies in recognition of student completion of accredited IIG courses and programs;*
- *establishing fellowships, scholarships, bursaries, prizes, awards and other student rewards and assistance to recognize completion and proficiency in the subjects taught at the IIG;*
- *maintaining, enhancing and ensuring access to a comprehensive centralized library and archives on Indigenous Peoples and issues of import to Indigenous Peoples; and*
- *generally promoting and advancing the objects of the IIG.*

---

[10] Issues 2.1 and 2.2 of the Research Plan are addressed in this section.

Respondents' Views (March 3, 1995)

To address the first part of this issue, whether there is a clear understanding of the IIG's mission, community representatives were asked about the relevance of the IIG's mission and objectives to their community. The representatives of five communities were asked these questions: one member of the UBCIC who is not on the IIG's Board and whose community is not participating in the extension program, representatives from the two communities participating in the extension program, and representatives from two communities not in the extension program. Most representatives interviewed understood the self-government mission of the IIG, although one community learned of the IIG and its mission through information provided by the evaluators.[11] However, the evaluation does not provide information on how well other members of these communities understood the IIG's mission.

To evaluate the issues of relevance to the needs of Aboriginal communities, information was gathered through interviews and focus groups with current and former students;[12] and interviews with key members of participating and non-participating Aboriginal communities.

Students were asked whether the IIG's mission, program and curriculum were relevant to their educational needs. Current IIG students were also asked whether they thought the IIG was meeting their expectations. In the survey, students were asked to rate their level of satisfaction that, overall, the IIG was meeting the expectations they had of it when they applied. Table 2-1 reports the average satisfaction ratings, with a measure of 1 being extremely unsatisfied, 4 being neither satisfied or unsatisfied, and 7 being extremely satisfied. It is clear that both the Vancouver and Lillooet students believed their expectations were realized. However, Saanich students expressed significantly lower levels of satisfaction. These results are consistent with the comments made by students in the focus groups.

Students were attracted to the Institute's curriculum on an indigenous government and wanted to learn *"about Aboriginal history from an Aboriginal perspective."* Some respondents expected that this education would be directly related towards a further career in indigenous administration. Others expressed the intrinsic value of learning about native history and colonization. Many students found the notion of an *"institute run by Natives for Natives"* to be of high value, its focus on self-government to be unique, and highly regarded the IIG's degree-granting status.

The majority of students were not disappointed in their expectations. Most students were satisfied with the academic program, although some were disappointed with particular academic courses and standards. A few Saanich respondents found the education insufficient for their professional needs; for instance, one respondent expected that the IIG would provide a better foundation for working on land claims.

---

11 The evaluators provided all respondents with a profile of the IIG, including its mission and a description of its programs before conducting the interview or focus group.

12 The term, current students, refers to respondents who were students at the time of data collection. Former students refers to respondents who had been IIG students, but were not at the time of data collection.

TABLE 2-1
Student Satisfaction that Their Expectations were Met

Campus	Average Rating *
Vancouver Campus	
Focus Groups (n = 21)	6.1
Non-focus Groups (n =14)	5.8
Overall (n = 35)	5.9
Saanich Campus	
Focus Groups (n = 5)	3.2
Non-focus Groups (n = 6)	3.5
Overall (n = 11)	3.4
Lillooet Campus	
Focus Groups (n = 2) **	4.5
Non-focus Groups (n = 6)	5.5
Overall (n = 8)	5.0

* A seven-point rating scale was used, with 1 = extremely unsatisfied, and 7 = extremely satisfied.
** With only two respondents, this average should be interpreted with caution.

When asked more specifically whether IIG's programs and services would meet their post-secondary education needs, a clear majority of students reported a high level of satisfaction. As can be seen from Table 2-2, Vancouver students were significantly more satisfied than were either Lillooet or Saanich students. A large number of Vancouver students who participated in focus groups were impressed with the significance of the curriculum. Some students discussed the emotional impact of the program: *"...it disturbed me (at first); the more knowledge I got, the more I got angered. But now I know that I can make a difference."* The subject of colonization, and how it personally applied to them as Natives, was thought to require more support from counsellors and elders than was available.

During the focus group discussions, some students brought up the issue of the quality of instruction. Saanich students who participated in the focus group thought that the quality of instruction was inconsistent and the content was inadequate. One Saanich student who was not in the focus group, but had submitted comments with the survey, described a contrasting view, and stated that the instructor *"brings out the best in me...."* One Vancouver student was clearly dissatisfied with instructors not enforcing deadlines.

Two of the four students who left before completing their studies did not feel that the IIG fully met their expectations. The other former student only audited one course, and was very satisfied with the experience. One of the two respondents who left early did so because the respondent was losing interest, especially since most of the information being presented wasn't new or sufficiently challenging. The other left for medical reasons, but also thought the program was not sufficiently challenging.

TABLE 2-2
Student Satisfaction that IIG Programs and Curriculum Met Educational Needs

Campus	Average Rating *
Vancouver Campus	
Focus Groups (n = 21)	6.1
Non-focus Groups (n =14)	6.1
Overall (n = 35)	6.1
Saanich Campus	
Focus Groups (n = 5)	3.6
Non-focus Groups (n = 6)	4.5
Overall (n = 11)	4.1
Lillooet Campus	
Focus Groups (n = 2) **	4.0
Non-focus Groups (n = 6)	5.4
Overall (n = 8)	4.7

* A seven-point rating scale was used, with 1 = extremely unsatisfied, and 7 = extremely satisfied.
** With only two respondents, this average should be interpreted with caution.

Local relevance of the curriculum was mentioned as important by representatives from three different communities. Representatives from two communities not in the extension program, commented that the IIG's mission was relevant to their community if delivered locally. Saanich respondents, both students and community representatives, mentioned the need for curriculum development to have more community-specific content. Nevertheless, respondents from both participating and non-participating communities, saw the necessity and relevance for their community for a degree-granting specialized program like the IIG.

In the context of the IIG's relevance, it is worth noting that one community that had not participated in the IIG extension program was invited to participate in this evaluation but refused. It was their perception that the IIG was not relevant to their community, since they have been participating in the BC Treaty Commission process.[13]

Some representatives in communities not participating in the extension program wanted more information about the IIG. Some were unsure of the IIG's accreditation status and would need to be assured beforehand that the IIG's courses can transfer to other post-secondary institutions in BC. Further, they were unclear as to the types of potential career placements available to the IIG graduates.

[13] The Union of BC Indian Chiefs is opposed to the B.C. Treaty Commission process.

The relevance that the IIG holds for Aboriginal communities is reflected in the words of one community representative contacted for this evaluation: *"I have great hopes for the IIG. The Institute of Indigenous Government is a great idea for our people. Given our people a chance to grow. Given our people a chance to have some say in education our young people."*

Conclusions

The IIG's mission is understood as indigenous self-government and Aboriginal control of education for Aboriginal people, by most of the community representatives contacted for this evaluation. It is not possible to know from this evaluation, though, how widespread is this understanding of the IIG's mission beyond the communities contacted for this evaluation.

The IIG's mission is clearly seen as a major strength of the Institute; almost all respondents view the mission as a visionary statement. For most, it reflects the necessity of a unique specialized post-secondary program in Indigenous Government studies for indigenous people. At this early stage in the IIG's development, the mission statement serves as the incentive and continuing vision for potential and current students, as well as for Aboriginal community members. The association of the IIG with the Union may influence the perception of the IIG's relevance to Aboriginal communities, by implying that the IIG's programs are relevant only for those who share the political views of the UBCIC. The evaluation provides very limited information on this issue, however; hence it is not possible to determine the extent of this perception.

The majority of students believed that the IIG was meeting their expectations and were satisfied with its academic program. Some students, however, were unsatisfied with how the mission was being realized. Their concerns included the need for local content in the curriculum and the need for credit transfer arrangement with other institutions. Insufficient support for students as they dealt with the emotional issues that the curriculum raised was also a concern. It is, however, too early in the life of the IIG to draw conclusions about how effectively the mission is being realized.

2.2 Implementation Status

Issue: Has the Institute been implemented as intended (as depicted in the logic chart and in the plan)? If not, why? Has the implementation of the IIG been hampered by barriers?[14]

Information on the implementation status of the IIG was taken from documents, such as minutes of the meetings of the Board, and reports to the Board, and from interviews with the various people responsible for implementation.

[14] Covered in this section are issues 3.1 and 4.3 part c, as delineated in the July 1997 Research Plan.

According to the Agreement between the Province of British Columbia and the Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs, it is expected that the development of the Institute would take five years to reach its full operational level with a minimum of 250 students. The time frame in the Agreement required that:

- the president, bursar and registrar be appointed and sufficient instructors be hired for first term delivery by August 15, 1995;

- curriculum be developed and premises for the operation of the IIG be established by August 15, 1995;

- first semester students be registered by August 15, 1995;

- the IIG deliver certificate, diploma and degree programs through joint credentialing with the Open Learning Agency for a two year period ending August 31, 1997; and

- after four years of development, and submission of a satisfactory proposal, the Province shall designate a baccalaureate degree, which the IIG shall grant as the Bachelor of Indigenous Government Studies.

The IIG was about halfway through its five-year developmental period when this evaluation was conducted. A review of the status of its implementation at the time of writing follows.

- The IIG was designated as a Provincial Institute on May 26, 1995. The agreement with the Province to fund the IIG was signed on June 9, 1995. By August 15, 1995, nine weeks later, the IIG had established premises in downtown Vancouver, had hired instructors, a president, a bursar and a registrar and had developed curriculum for the first semester. It had also registered students for the first semester.

- The IIG is governed by a Board of Governors, which is responsible for ensuring that the mission of the IIG is carried out. Members of the Board are nominated by the UBCIC to represent Indigenous Nations in BC and up to four "eminent persons", and are appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. The Board held its first meeting in December 1995. There were 15 members on the Board, including one instructor, one non-instructional staff and two student representatives when this evaluation was conducted.

- Premises for the IIG were established in the same building where the Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs is located. Initially, the IIG occupied the third floor and part of the fourth floor. The Union's library occupied the remainder of the fourth floor. Since opening, the IIG has expanded each year. At the beginning of its second year, the IIG expanded into the basement, which was finished by the landlord specifically for the IIG's use. In the second year, the basement housed offices for the registrar, the bursar, and instructors, the faculty lounge and the computer lab. At the beginning of the third year, the IIG expanded into the second floor. Two rooms on this floor are used for

classrooms and can hold up to 29 students. The original classrooms on the 3rd floor accommodate 10 and 15 students each. The bursar's office has been moved to the second floor and plans are in place to move the computer lab to the second floor at the end of the Fall semester of the third year, since the basement is not wheelchair accessible. There are two other, as yet, unused rooms on the second floor. The Registrar's office was moved to the fourth floor at the beginning of the 1997/98 academic year. Renovations have been made on both the third and fourth floor in the fall of 1997 to provide secure space for the registrar's office and to move the reception area from the basement to the third floor.

- In the first year (1995-96), a total of 11 courses were offered over two semesters. By the fall of 1997, IIG had developed 40 first year and second courses in Indigenous Government Studies. All curriculum for IIG courses are developed at the IIG by instructors and curriculum developers. Community-based curriculum may be developed at the community level for delivery through the extension program, although this had not yet taken place at the time of writing.

- By the end of the spring semester in 1996, IIG had graduated two students with Certificates in Indigenous Government Studies. By the end of its first two complete years, 16 students had completed one of the IIG's programs: three were awarded an Associate of Arts degree and 13 received certificates in Indigenous Government Studies.

- In the first year, the IIG delivered its academic program with 4.5 full-time faculty and 2 sessional instructors. A total of 7 full-time faculty and 10 sessional instructors are involved in delivering the academic program in its third year. All but three of the full-time faculty are indigenous people from around the world.

- The IIG's education plan consists of three program areas: the academic program delivered on the main campus, the extension and distance education program to provide instruction throughout BC, and the international program to focus on global Indigenous issues and establish relations with Indigenous people world-wide. In its first two and half years, the IIG has concentrated on developing its academic and extension programs, and has only had exploratory discussions with potential international partners.

- The extension program was initiated in the Spring semester, 1996, at the Saanich Nation's Adult Education Centre. A full-time program is offered, which will allow Saanich students to graduate with an Associate of Arts degree in two years of three semesters each. A part-time extension program began in Lillooet in the Fall of 1996. Because of low enrollments, the Lillooet extension program was put on hold as of the end of December 1997. IIG Instructors commuted to these locations from Vancouver. Extension Co-ordinators were hired for Vancouver Island, and for Lillooet to recruit students and provide a liaison between extension students and the IIG. Due to budget constraints and lower than planned enrollments, both co-ordinators have been terminated, and further expansion of the extension program has been put on hold.

- According to the Strategic Initiatives Agreement, the IIG would partner with the Open Learning Agency to develop and implement an extension program which will allow up to 80% of IIG students to pursue their studies in regional centres and First Nations communities. Although no time frame was specified, this goal is now being reconsidered. Extension programming has not been delivered in partnership with the Open Learning Agency. The extension programming that has been delivered, as well as the possibilities that have been pursued, have largely been in Aboriginal communities. In the spring of 1997, extension sites were considered for Duncan, the William Head Correctional Centre, Lytton, Mount Currie and the Yukon Territory for this academic year. The plans for these extension sites were put on hold because of financial considerations and limited enrollments. The IIG administration has concluded that the cost of delivering extension programs requires a minimum of 20 students enrolled at the site. They have also determined that a plan for its extension program must be developed before it can expand further.

- Other models of delivering academic programs to students outside the lower mainland are being explored. In January 1998, the Internet will be used to deliver a computer science course, as a pilot. In the Fall of 1997, the HRDC agreed to fund an electronic classroom pilot project. The purpose of this pilot is to set up an electronic classroom on the Vancouver campus and at one remote site somewhere else in the province and to use these classrooms to pilot the remote delivery of a course. The technology will enable instruction to be live and interactive. The pilot is expected to be carried out in the winter of 1998. Both pilots will explore how to provide student support, such as access to Elders and library resources.

- University transfer credit agreements have been developed with the Open University and with the University of Northern British Columbia (UNBC) for the courses that are a requirement for the Associate of Arts degree. The IIG is in the process of developing a block transfer agreement with the UNBC and has begun the process of developing credit transfer agreements with University of British Columbia. IIG is planning to start the process with the University of Victoria and Simon Fraser University later in the third year.

- A four-year program of courses leading to a Baccalaureate in Indigenous Government Studies is planned for the 1999/2000 academic year. The IIG will begin the process of obtaining approval for the BA program by delivering a letter of intent to the Ministry during the 1997/98 academic year. A full proposal for the program will be submitted to the Degree Program Review Committee by April 1 1998, assuming that Ministry approval to proceed is received.

- One of the unique characteristics of the IIG's program is its student development program. Historically, Indigenous people have been less likely than non-Indigenous people to attend post-secondary educational institutions and even less likely to graduate. The purpose of the student development program is to provide a supportive learning environment to ensure that indigenous students are successful by promoting their academic, cultural and emotional development. Workshops on study skills are

provided and academic upgrading is available through partnership with the Hastings Learning Centre. The student development counsellor provides academic and career counselling. In the 1996-97 year, the program included a half-time counsellor to provide support to students dealing with personal issues. Due to budget constraints, this position was not filled in the 1997-98 year. Resident Elders provide advise and counsel to students and employees and leadership in spiritual and cultural matters and also play a key role in assisting in curriculum development. The Elders also provide traditional teaching lessons (for credit) on various aspects of indigenous values, culture and history. The IIG had one student development counsellor and two resident elders[15] for the Vancouver campus at the time of writing. Usually elders rotate so that only one elder is on campus during any two-week period, although sometimes there are two elders on campus at the same time.

Respondents' Views

Those involved in the implementation of the IIG, the members of the Board, administrators, and instructors, were asked whether the educational plan of the IIG was appropriate to its mission and realistic given its resources. Key federal and provincial government stakeholders were also asked this question. In addition, Board members and administrators were asked whether there were barriers to the implementation of the IIG's five year plan and, if so, to identify these barriers.

All respondents, whether Board members, administrators, instructors or government stakeholders, enthusiastically support the IIG's mission and feel that the educational plan is appropriate. The unique curriculum of the IIG is seen as its strength. In the words of one respondent, *"the plan is visionary and sensible."* The people involved in implementing the IIG were clearly motivated by a sense of mission. The high degree of support for the IIG's mission and educational plan is reflected in the statement made by one government stakeholder: *"IIG is doing in spades what all other institutions should be doing."*

Almost no respondents had anything negative to say about the appropriateness of IIG's educational plan. One non-instructional staff member observed that delivering on the mission is a challenge because Aboriginal nations differ from each other and hence it is not always easy to find a common understanding. Another respondent commented on the need for more community input into the development of curriculum so that local content is included in curriculum delivered at extension sites. One government stakeholder thought that, although the concept is right, the IIG is trying to offer too many courses than can be justified given the size of its enrollment.

Of the respondents (i.e., IIG Board members, administrators, instructors and selected non-instructional staff) asked whether the plan is realistic given the IIG's resources, 46% could not answer; eighteen percent thought the plan was realistic given the resources, and thirty-six percent believed the resources were not adequate to deliver the plan. The most frequently mentioned concern is the challenge in delivering the extension program given

[15] A third elder is on indefinite leave.

the IIG's resources. One respondent from the IIG expressed the view that if extension plans cannot be delivered, then the IIG is not fully living up to its mission. Another IIG respondent observed that, for financial reasons, the international program may not be realistic because Aboriginal people from other countries may not be able to afford to attend the IIG. On the other hand, another respondent from the IIG offered the view that international partnering is realistic.

Three of the six members of the Board were aware of a few barriers to the full implementation of the IIG's plan. The barriers they identified were limited financial resources to support Board development and planning, little effort and no plan to raise money through fundraising, weak partnerships with Aboriginal people and with the federal and provincial government, and uncertainty over government funding.

Administrators are intimately involved in the implementation of the IIG's educational plan and are aware of the challenges they face. They were asked whether there were barriers, other than financial, to achieving the IIG's five-year plan. Three of the six respondents identified non-financial concerns that they thought were barriers. These perceived barriers were:

- resentment of the IIG's independent status by some Aboriginal post-secondary institutions (2 respondents);
- the IIG has not been supported by Ministry bureaucrats because they have not endorsed the philosophy of a separate Aboriginal educational institution since they were not involved in negotiations for the original funding of the IIG;
- there has been little communication within the Ministry to ensure that Ministry personnel are aware of the IIG; and
- the association with the UBCIC has limited the effectiveness of recruitment efforts by limiting recruitment potential to those communities that have been associated with the UBCIC.

Further information on student funding is provided later in this chapter. The financial issues for the institution itself are discussed in the next chapter. Findings pertaining to the governance and management of the IIG are presented in Chapter 4.

Conclusions

For the most part, the Institute has been implemented as intended. It has developed and delivered both a certificate program and an associate of arts degree program and is in the process of developing a four-year Baccalaureate program, as specified in its original plan. The most significant departure from the IIG's five-year plan is its extension program.

The IIG has encountered barriers that have hampered its implementation. The primary barriers have been lack of time for adequate planning and insufficient financial resources. Each of these issues is explored in some detail later in this report. It is important to note here, though, that the implementation of the IIG was carried out with only a minimal time

provided for planning at the beginning. There were roughly nine weeks from the time the agreement with the provincial government was signed until the IIG had to be ready to deliver its first semester. During this time, the IIG had to be created. That is, staff had to be hired, facilities obtained, curriculum developed, students recruited, admissions procedures developed, etc., all within a nine-week period.

This is not typical of the implementation of a post-secondary institution in British Columbia. There are only two recent examples for comparison: Royal Roads and the University of Northern British Columbia (UNBC). UNBC had three years to plan and develop before it had to receive students. Royal Roads had about a year and a half. Admittedly, the IIG is a very small institution. However, size is only one factor to consider. When recruiting staff, time is needed to conduct an effective search, and generally people will need to give their current employer notice before they can take a new job. For student recruitment, time is even more of an issue, since students must make their decisions about post-secondary education early enough to apply for funding.

Given these constraints, the extent to which the implementation of the IIG is on track should be considered an achievement.

2.3 Student Profile and Enrollment

Issue: Who are the students attending IIG? Is the Institute achieving its enrollment targets? If not, why? Are enrollment targets unrealistic or are there barriers for students accessing the IIG, or for the IIG achieving these targets?[16]

As of December 1, 1997, 115 students were enrolled in classes at one of the three locations. A profile of the age and gender these students, for the Vancouver and extension locations, is provided in Table 2-3. The demographics of the 115 students are as follow:

- more than 95% of the students are Aboriginal;
- 65% of the students are from British Columbia;
- the students represent 78 different First Nations communities;
- 60% of the students overall are female, although the gender distribution varies across campuses, with proportionally fewer males at Lillooet than at the other campuses;
- overall, 60% of the students are over 30 years of age, while only 8% are under 21; and
- the age distribution varies from campus to campus, with a higher proportion of both younger and older students on the Vancouver campus than on either of the other two campuses.

Three-quarters of the students have federal funding provided through their bands.

---

[16] Issues 6.2 and 6.3 of the Research Plan are addressed here.

TABLE 2-3
Profile of Registered IIG Students as of December 1, 1997

	Saanich			Lillooet			Vancouver			Overall		
Age Range	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
Under 21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	8	3	6	9
21 — 30	3	4	7	1	2	3	11	16	27	15	22	37
31 — 40	2	5	7	2	5	7	9	11	20	13	21	34
41 — 50	4	1	5	2	7	9	8	7	15	14	15	29
over 50	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	2	4	6
Total	10	11	21	5	14	19	32	43	75	47	68	115

The history of program completions is provided in Table 2-4. In total, 13 students have been awarded a certificate and three have been awarded an associate of arts degree. All except one of the 16 students was enrolled at the Vancouver campus. The other student was enrolled at Saanich. It is too early in the program at Lillooet for anyone to have completed the certificate program and it is too early for anyone at Saanich to have completed the associate of arts degree. Twelve of the 13 students who had been awarded a certificate were still attending the IIG, working towards the associate of arts degree, during the fall of 1997. Seventy-eight percent of the students from the 1996/97 year returned for the Fall 1997 semester.[17]

TABLE 2-4
Program Completions

Date Awarded	Certificate	Associate of Arts Degree
May 1996	2	0
May 1997	2	2
Fall 1997	9	1
Total	13	3

The basic elements of the IIG's development over its first five years are outlined in the IIG 1995 Proposal and Planning Paper. Included in the planning document are planned enrollments for the IIG over this five-year period. These planned FTE enrollments are provided in Table 2-5. Also included in the table are the actual un-audited FTEs.[18] Table 2-6 contains the planned and actual number of students for the same period. Both tables contain percentages to show the percentage of the enrollment target that the IIG has achieved in each year, as well as planned and actual growth rates in FTEs and student enrollments.

17 The IIG was not able to provide more detailed information to profile their students, or to profile the retention and completion history for each year, for each location.

18 The IIG has not yet had an enrollment audit.

TABLE 2-5
Planned and Actual FTE Enrollments

Academic Year	Planned * Number of FTEs	Actual Number of FTEs	Actual as Percentage of Planned	Planned Growth Rate	Actual Growth Rate
1995-1996	25 — 35	17	68%	—	—
1996-1997	75 — 100	50	67%	200%	194%
1997-1998	100 — 150	90 **	90%	33%	80%
1998-1999	150 — 250	***	93%	50%	56%
1999-2000	250 — 300	—	—	—	—

* From the IIG's 1995 Proposal and Planning Paper.
** 44 FTEs to September 30 1997, estimate of 90 FTEs to March 31 1998.
*** Revised estimate of FTEs for 1998-1999 is 140.

TABLE 2-6
Planned and Actual Student Enrollments

Academic Year	Planned * Number of Students	Actual Number of Students	Actual as Percentage of Planned	Planned Growth Rate	Actual Growth Rate
1995-1996	50 — 70	28	56%	—	—
1996-1997	150 — 100	97	65%	200%	246%
1997-1998	200 — 250	135 **	68%	33%	39%
1998-1999	250 — 300	***	80%	25%	48%
1999-2000	300 — 350	—	—	—	—

* From the IIG's 1995 Proposal and Planning Paper.
** 115 students to September 30 1997, estimate of 135 to March 31 1998.
*** Revised estimate of number of students for 1998-1999 is 200.

As both Tables 2-5 and 2-6 demonstrate, the IIG has not achieved its target enrollments, either in terms of FTEs or number of students. The percentage of the target enrollment that the IIG has achieved has increased considerably from the first to third year. The IIG is expecting that in its third year, it will achieve 90 percent of the target FTEs for that year.[19] Although the actual enrollment is lower than expected, especially for the first year, the actual rate of growth in enrollment (either in terms of FTEs or number of students) is higher than was planned. For FTEs, the rate of growth in the third year was much higher than was planned, while the growth in the number of students was much higher than planned in the second year.

Table 2-7 shows enrollment as a proportion of FTEs, which reflects the number of enrolled students needed to make the equivalent of one FTE. An FTE is equivalent to one student taking five courses in each of two semesters. This proportion changes over

19 The IIG proposal and planning paper listed enrollment ranges for each year. Percentages have been calculated using the lower end of the range as the base. Thus, the percentages are higher than they would be if calculated in any other way (i.e., using a mid-point or upper end of the range).

time. In the first year, approximately 1.65 students were needed to make one FTE. In the second year, the proportion increased to almost 2 students. This means that on average, students in the second year were taking fewer courses than were students in the first year. The proportion has decreased to 1.5 for the third year and is expected to decrease further for the fourth year. This means that the IIG will need fewer students to achieve FTE targets in the future, if this trend continues.

TABLE 2-7
Comparison of FTSs and Number of Students

Academic Year	Actual Number of Students	Actual Number of FTEs	Number of Students as Proportion of FTEs
1995-1996	28	17	1.65
1996-1997	97	50	1.94
1997-1998	135 *	90 *	1.50
1998-1999	200 **	140 **	1.43
1999-2000	—	—	—

* Estimate to March 31 1998.
** Revised estimate for 1998-1999.

Respondents' Views

IIG administrators were asked why the IIG has not achieved its enrollment targets and whether there were barriers that may limit enrollment. There were basically four reasons offered for why the IIG has not achieved it enrollment targets. The most frequently mentioned reason is problems in student funding. These are discussed in detail later in this chapter, under *Access*. The second most frequently cited reason is lack of awareness of the IIG, or need for more effective recruitment strategies. Issues pertaining to recruitment are dealt with later in this chapter.

Late start in recruiting for the first year was mentioned as the likely reason for the low initial enrollment, since the IIG was not approved as a provincial institute until late in May, after the normal recruitment period for September enrollment. The late recruitment would also affect student funding, since students would be applying too late to guarantee funding. To reduce the impact of this, the UBCIC agreed to pay the tuition of all students enrolled in the first term who required support.

The need for reliable and affordable day care was mentioned as one barrier, since the majority of the IIG's students are women, many of them single parents. Ties to their local community was also offered as a reason for students not being willing to relocate to Vancouver. Barriers to student access are discussed more fully in the section under *Access*, later in this chapter.

Board members were also asked why the IIG is not achieving its enrollment targets. They offered three types of reasons. Lack of awareness of the IIG, and the need for the IIG to establish its credibility were the most frequently cited reasons for the lower enrollment. Two board members pointed out that, for various reasons, potential students may need

academic upgrading before they can enter the IIG. Limited funding for students was mentioned by one member of the Board. As one Board member observed, the reasons for barriers to student access are complex: *"the target population for the IIG has been the subject of colonization for over a hundred years and the multi-generational problems which are present in the communities-economic and social-all are barriers to higher education."*

Conclusions

The IIG is not achieving the enrollment targets as set out in its five-year plan. The late start that the IIG had in recruiting students for its first year is likely why the enrollment for the first year was down from planned; there was only nine weeks, and initially no staff to do recruiting. Given enrollment for the Fall 1997 and expected enrollment for the remainder of the third academic year, the IIG expects to be at about 90% of their expected enrollment, in terms of full time equivalent students for the third year. Given that the number of students for each year all fall within the planned FTE range, it is possible that the IIG overestimated the number of students who would be taking a full load of five courses per term. In fact, not all IIG students have been able to take five courses for academic reasons, as some need to do some upgrading before they will be permitted to register for certain courses. For example, some students have been required to upgrade their math skills before they can register in the statistics course. In other cases, students have chosen to take a lower course load so they can concentrate their efforts on fewer courses at one time. Other barriers to access, such as student funding, are discussed later in this chapter.

2.4 Recruitment

Issue: Does the IIG conduct effective recruitment of students both for the main campus and extension and distance education? Is the Institute promoted effectively? Are Aboriginal communities in BC sufficiently aware of the Mission and programs of the IIG? If not, why? How can the Institute improve its ability to reach the intended audience?[20]

A proactive recruitment strategy for both on and off campus instruction was outlined in the IIG's 1995 Proposal and Planning Paper. Working in tandem with the IIG Extension Program and local band education co-ordinators, basic elements of the IIG recruitment strategy were to involve:

- the development of an academic calendar outlining relevant information for prospective students to be distributed to band education co-ordinators and Indigenous organizations throughout BC and Canada;

- links with Indigenous education committees, band and tribal councils in order to provide extensive program information;

[20] Issue 6.1 of the Research Plan is addressed in this section.

- visits from the IIG Extension Co-ordinator to bands from across the province to inform our people about the Institute in general, and about educational opportunities for Indigenous students at the IIG; and

- an orientation for prospective IIG students conducted at both the Institute and in selected indigenous communities in the Interior, the Lower Mainland and on Vancouver Island.

The following materials have been developed for use in recruiting students to the IIG:

- A video about the IIG, featuring students and elders who were at the IIG in its first year; this video has since been translated into Spanish. It has been distributed to organizations with a potential interest in the IIG, and has been used when presentations about the IIG have been given.

- An annual calendar is produced, which contains information on registration and courses, as well as information about IIG's mission, programs and staff. The calendar has included black and white photographs of the IIG students, faculty, sessional instructors, elders and non-instructional staff, as well as photographs of events at the IIG.

- A web site with information about the IIG's mission, programs and courses and how to register.

- Posters, brochures and information packages, which have been distributed to people upon request, and sent to organizations and communities.

Recruitment activities have included:

- presentations by IIG staff at various Aboriginal communities in British Columbia, Pow-Wows, career fairs, and educational institutions;

- distribution of the video, calendar, posters and other materials to organizations and Aboriginal communities;

- tours of the IIG for interested visitors; and

- advertisements in various First Nations and community newspapers and newsletters, and on bus routes in Vancouver, Victoria and Prince George.

Initial recruitment efforts resulted in the enrollment of mature students for the most part. Since mature students have not always been able to enroll without first doing some academic upgrading, the IIG has re-focused its recruitment efforts to focus on potential students who are academically ready to attend the IIG. Since June of 1997, recruitment activities have focused on secondary school students, especially those graduating from grade 12, in the lower mainland. The goal of this revised plan is to double enrollment over the 12 to 15 month period from July 1997.

Respondents' Views

In an effort to understand the effectiveness of the IIG's effort to increase awareness and interest in the Institute, students and Aboriginal communities were asked how they first learned about the IIG. For students from extension sites, word-of-mouth was the typical manner in which they learned about the institute. They cited Extension Co-ordinators, Education Co-ordinators and Pow-Wows as the main sources of information on the IIG. Vancouver students, though, had a more diverse introduction to the IIG. The following is a summary of how Vancouver students learned about the IIG:

- organizations such as the Canadian Council of Aboriginal Businesses, the UBCIC meeting, the Friendship Centre;
- cultural events including Pow-Wows, cultural festivities;
- media, including signs, calendars;
- personal contacts including friends, Educational Co-ordinators; and
- previous educational experiences including institutional tours and the Native Education Centre (a common response).

Both participating and non-participating Aboriginal communities were also asked how they first learned about the IIG. Lillooet was approached by the IIG to determine the feasibility of offering extension courses in their community. Saanich first heard about the IIG at meetings of the Union of BC Indian Chiefs. Having just purchased a building for adult education, Saanich took the initiative in approaching the IIG to discuss the potential of adult education programming.

Cowichan, a non-participating Aboriginal community, approached the IIG after a member of the community read an article on the IIG provided through an HRDC Aboriginal training program. Representatives from the IIG and the Saanich Extension Co-ordinator, upon the community's request, held an information session, including a video, in the community. Respondents in the Penticton Community learned about the IIG from the evaluators.

Members of the Union and the Board, IIG administrators, instructors and non-instructional staff, students, and government stakeholders were asked for their opinion on the effectiveness of recruitment strategies and possible improvements. In addition, Aboriginal communities and organizations were asked how their community learned about the IIG's mission and objectives and whether they were satisfied with how the IIG was raising awareness and interest.

Board members were asked if they were satisfied with IIG's strategies for recruiting students for both the main campus and extension sites and distance education programs. Three Board members were pleased with the IIG's efforts to date and suggested that the

IIG had circulated material to all the bands and interested organizations. The three others indicated that there was still room for improvement. These three respondents identified the following factors that they thought have limited the effectiveness of recruitment:

- Natives operate best on "face to face" communication rather than printed material, but the IIG has not had the money for travel and the time needed to do this properly (3 respondents);

- there have not been enough people doing recruitment and promoting the IIG (2 respondents); and

- it has been difficult to get the attention of native councils (1 respondent).

The majority of administrators were aware of the change of focus from general recruitment to one that has been targeted towards potential students who would soon be eligible to attend the IIG. Two administrators did not indicate whether or not they were satisfied. Three of the remaining four administrators thought that the IIG was gradually developing recruitment strategies, and seemed satisfied with the progress being made. One administrator was not satisfied with recruitment and thought that the lack of funding had been limiting the effectiveness of recruiting practices. Suggestions that administrators made about improving recruitment are provided in Appendix C.

The majority of instructors (5 out of 8) did not know whether recruitment strategies were effective. Of the other three, one had some concerns, one was not satisfied and one thought that recruitment was getting better. Only two respondents offered specific reasons for their concerns: recruitment was not co-ordinated enough and recruitment was too focused on the Vancouver area. One instructor added that public schools can be an alienating experience for native students and that the lack of a support system could restrict recruitment efforts. One suggested that recruitment for indigenous students needs to present the IIG as a goal for students and a reason to stay in school. Another instructor emphasized that potential students needed to understand the funding options available to them.

Two out of the six non-instructional staff interviewed were satisfied with recruitment and four had some concerns, although two of these thought recruitment was improving. Barriers that non-instructional staff identified to effective recruitment were: lack of time at start-up for recruitment, insufficient resources for extension co-ordinators and for travel, and the influence of UBCIC politics on determining extension sites. Four of the six respondents also commented that the IIG had moved too fast to set-up extension sites in response to the question on recruitment, implying that recruitment for extension was premature because the IIG was not ready to deliver the extension program.

Half of the eight external stakeholders who were asked, did not feel they could provide an informed view on the IIG's recruitment strategies. One stakeholder was enthusiastic about IIG's marketing program, but three others thought that the promotion of the IIG was lacking. One of these expressed concerns that the IIG recruitment was hampered by

UBCIC politics. Another observed that there was a lack of awareness among Aboriginal communities. *"I am quite connected to the Aboriginal community but I, and other key people I deal with, don't hear about it. That's an informal indicator for me....I don't see them serving the larger audience of Aboriginal peoples; I don't see participation in larger cultural events."*

Conclusions

As indicated in Chapter 1, results from selected Aboriginal communities that pertain to the issues of recruitment and access cannot be generalized to *all* Aboriginal communities in British Columbia. There is some evidence, however, that the IIG's attempts to raise awareness of the Institute may be inconsistent, and only partially effective. This is consistent with the observation that some of the communities we contacted for this evaluation, including one that refused to participate, had not heard about the IIG.

As of December 1997, IIG has had only 9 students under 21 years of age. This may be a reflection of the focus of their recruitment strategies. The IIG's strategy concerning recruitment, though, has been modified in light of this assumption. The redirected emphasis towards recruiting potential students who could be eligible to attend the IIG in the near future and networking with high schools will likely increase the number of younger students.

As discussed earlier, the short planning and implementation time frame provided little time for recruitment activities in 1995. Given the quick start of the IIG, it has made a reasonable beginning in developing an effective recruitment strategy.

2.5 Access

Issue: Does lack of financial resources for Aboriginal students create a barrier to access? Are there other barriers to accessing the Institute, such as the IIG's location or the special needs of its student?[21]

As mentioned in Chapter 2, two-thirds of the IIG's students in the Fall of 1997 had funding to attend the IIG through their bands. Student loans and personal savings were the other usual means of support for IIG students.

There were at least six students attending the IIG in the 1997/98 academic year who had some type of disability requiring special support from the IIG. Two of these students were in wheelchairs, three had a visual impairment and required enlarged print and another student had a hearing impairment.

Wheelchair access to the IIG had been provided through a rear door, as the elevator cannot be accessed in a wheelchair from the front door. The basement, which has contained faculty offices and had the computer lab until the end of 1997, has not been wheelchair accessible. To enable students in wheelchairs to take the computer course with other

[21] Issue 6.1 of the Research Plan is addressed in this section.

students, the computer lab was moved to the second floor for the Winter 1998 semester. A special reader that enlarges print has been provided for students needing enlarged print.

The IIG has taken some steps to address safety concerns, including retaining a security guard and security monitors. In addition, police conduct safety sessions twice a year with employees and students.

Findings on student access issues are presented under two headings, one pertaining to student funding, and the other dealing with all other access issues, including the IIG's location, and the special needs of students.

Respondents' Views on Student Funding

To evaluate the issues of student funding, information was gathered from members of the Union and the Board, the administration, instructors and non-instructional staff, students, Aboriginal communities and organizations, as well as government stakeholders. Respondents were asked what funding options were available to potential IIG students, how potential and current students can obtain information on the available funding options, and if they were aware of any funding barriers to accessing the IIG.

All Board members, administrators, Aboriginal communities, most IIG non-instructional staff and some instructors, and most of the external stakeholders were aware of at least the two typical student funding options: band funding that is provided by the Department of Indian Affairs and the student loans (including BC and Canada Student Loans). Some instructors (3 out of 8), were not aware of the funding options available for students. Some respondents were also aware of scholarships and bursaries, while a few thought that these would be available in the future. Other funding options suggested by respondents are listed in Appendix C.

Respondents were asked how potential and continuing students could obtain information on the funding options available to them. While most representatives from Aboriginal Communities, IIG administrators and non-instructional staff has views about where students could obtain information on funding options, many of the instructors and members of the Board did not know. The most typical response provided was either the resident IIG financial aid or student assistance officer, or band contacts such as the Educational Co-ordinator.

The following is a summary of other informational sources suggested by respondents:

- IIG sources such as the institutional calendar, IIG's information kiosk, the registrar's office;
- other public post-secondary and secondary institutions; the Native Education Centre;
- the internet; a 1-800 phone number to the British Columbia Student Services Branch;
- government agencies, such as Human Resources Centres of Canada; MLA offices.

Respondents were subsequently asked if funding barriers existed for potential students, and if so, to describe these barriers. The prevalent theme that emerged from respondent's answers to this question is that bands do not have enough funding for post-secondary education to meet the demand. According to respondents, this leads to restrictive criteria to determine how to allocate the limited funds, and insufficient funds result in waitlists at some bands, or force students to seek student loans. Respondents provided several examples of criteria for band sponsorship that may serve as barriers to access (note, since each band can develop their own criteria, some of these concerns may apply to only some bands):

- high school graduates may be given priority over returning or mature students and less experienced students may have a higher priority than more experienced students (2nd, 3rd, etc.);
- Métis and Non-status Aboriginals are not eligible;
- students not residing in their home community may not be eligible;
- there may be a lower priority for students with British Columbia and Canada Student Loans;
- mature students with other responsibilities may not be able to keep up with the 4 or 5 course load requirement, but if they reduce their course load below this they are no longer eligible for band funding;
- a limited number of years of funding for any one Aboriginal student may not be enough to complete their education, especially if taking less than five courses per semester, or if time spent doing upgrading in counted toward this limit (while some reported that funding was limited to 8 semesters, others reported as high as 7 years; this may vary according to the individual band); and
- the maximum funding amount for any one semester may not be enough to live on in Vancouver.

Other factors pertaining to band funding, that can act as barriers to access that were identified by respondents were:

- reluctance of some bands to fund potential IIG students due to the Institute's affiliation with the Union;
- band reluctance to fund potential IIG students due to a lack of familiarity with the Institute or concerns with the Institute's academic credentials, such as credit transfer arrangement.

Concerns were also expressed about federal and provincial student loans. Some Board members, administrators and non-instructional staff suggested that education should be

free because it is an inherent Aboriginal right that flows from Aboriginal title and the right to self-determination. In their opinion, student funding for post-secondary education for Aboriginal people is the responsibility of the federal government; hence it is inappropriate to expect native students to get student loans. As one Board member explained, not only is free education an Aboriginal right, it is also necessary, given the great economic imbalance between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people. This respondent feels that free education would also encourage greater participation in post-secondary education.

Respondents also reported problems with respect to federal and provincial student loans that can cause barriers to access:

- given the high levels of unemployment among Aboriginal people, some Aboriginal students who have experienced difficulty in mainstream institutions have defaulted on previous student loans and are therefore ineligible for further student loans;

- students may not be able to earn the base amount required for student loan application, given the high unemployment rate of Aboriginal people; and

- loan criteria regarding limits on assets may work against mature students.

Lack of awareness of the IIG can affect students in applying for student loans, as it can when applying for band funding. An example of this occurred when the Student Services Branch of the Ministry of Education, Skills and Training held up funding for IIG students for the third year of IIG's operation, because the Ministry had incorrectly classified the IIG as a private, rather than a public, institution.

Respondents have identified a variety of other challenges that students face that have some relation to funding:

- band co-ordinators take holidays in summer months, thus delaying student funding decisions;

- delays in obtaining student funding can result in students having difficulty finding housing;

- some students had missed deadlines to apply for student loans, either because they were unaware of the deadline, or they did not get a decision about band funding until after the loan deadline had passed;

- students may be reluctant to apply for student loans if they believe such funding to be a fiduciary responsibility of the federal government;

- the IIG does not actively encourage on-campus or local student employment opportunities;[22]

[22] In fact, IIG students have had employment opportunities at the IIG and have filled positions such as research assistant, computer lab assistant and library assistant.

- there is a lack of scholarships and bursaries sponsored by the IIG;
- the limited allocation of band funding for vocational training may force ill-prepared students to undertake academic education because funding for vocational training is not available;
- students, and potential students are not provided with good information on funding options, other than band funding and student loans;
- some students are poor financial planners; and
- inadequate funding can result in students needing to work part-time, which may impair their academic performance.

Students also thought that their financial support was inadequate. Band support was the mainstay for most students-both Vancouver and extension sites. Students thought that band funding was sufficient for books and tuition, but that student loans and other family support was needed to cover the cost of living. Many current and potential students were concerned about the cost of living in what they perceived to be a "high rental" city (Vancouver). The cost of living in Vancouver was also a concern with potential students in Aboriginal communities.

Four students who had left the IIG without completing their studies were interviewed to find out their reasons for leaving the IIG and whether they had had sufficient financial support while attending. One of the four had not left the IIG, but was only attending part-time and was not enrolled at the time of the interview because courses offered did not fit into the respondents work schedule. The remaining three students left for different reasons, as follows:

- chronic medical reasons;
- lost interest in the program since it was not sufficiently challenging; and
- had fallen behind due to illness in family and then funding was discontinued.

Three of the four reported that they had adequate financial support while attending the IIG. The former student who did not have adequate funding did not indicate what funding they had had, but did report that the funding had discontinued. The three who had adequate funding relied on various sources of support. One used personal savings. The two others had Band funding and worked and one of these also used personal savings.

Respondents' Views on the IIG's Location and Student Needs

IIG administrators, non-instructional staff and instructors, as well as members of the Board and students were asked whether the location of the main campus meets students' needs, considering transportation, access to housing, cost of living, and safety. They were also asked what steps may have been taken to eliminate barriers to access for groups such

as female students, students with disabilities and students with special needs. Stakeholders were asked whether there were any barriers to access for students, including the location and special needs of students.

The majority (77%) of the IIG's administrators, non-instructional staff, instructors and members of the Board were satisfied with the IIG's location. Three external stakeholders thought that the location was a barrier to access, one thought the location was an asset and the others either had no opinion or did not mention location. Reasons offered for why the IIG's location was viewed favourably were:

- the IIG is close to amenities and a downtown SFU campus and other Aboriginal organizations;
- it is close to the UBCIC library and downtown libraries (e.g. public, university); and
- it provides good access to public transportation (such as the skytrain, seabus and public transit).

Even respondents who were satisfied with the location of the IIG, did have some concerns with the location. The concerns of respondents are summarized here:

- Access was viewed unfavourably for students from extension sites because they may require use of the UBCIC library for required and supplemental materials and hence need to travel to the city, parking is expensive, the high cost of transportation.
- Some respondents viewed access to good housing as problematic. Due to students' limited finances, they tended to live in crowded living conditions, which are not conducive to study. In contrast, others saw the location as providing good access to housing, due to easy access to public transportation.
- Downtown Vancouver was seen as having a high cost of living, particularly for those with minimal funding and daycare expenses. While a few respondents viewed the area as attractive for students, others suggested that people won't want to go to Vancouver. In particular, one stakeholder suggested Aboriginal students from rural areas would be reluctant to attend an institution in a large metropolis.
- Safety was cited as a problem for downtown Vancouver-particularly the Gastown area, especially for those students taking evening classes. The area is noted as a "socially troubled part of Vancouver." There were some reports of strangers wandering into the institute, and females are not at ease.
- Theft has been a re-occurring issue for the IIG; student's lockers have helped to prevent loss of student items, although larger items, such as artwork fastened to the library wall, have been stolen.
- Other concerns include the lack of an appropriate site for cultural activities, and lack of available day care on site.

Most Vancouver students were favourable about converging and nearby transportation routes, and the access to the UBCIC and main libraries. On the other hand, Vancouver's cost of living was seen as high, the neighbourhood was seen as unsafe, and there was a scarcity of affordable housing.

Students were also asked if they had special needs that made it difficult for them to attend school without assistance. Vancouver students typically reported needs such as child-care expenses, lack of study support, and parking, but a prevailing theme was the need for emotional support. Although students believed that elders were helpful, the support available did not meet the need. There is no formal support system for Saanich and Lillooet students.

Students, non-instructional staff, administrators, and Board members were aware of the barriers that exist for the students in wheelchairs, since the design of the main campus building does not allow wheelchair access to either the front door of the building or the basement floor. In response to the needs of the students with disabilities, the IIG non-instructional staff has explored options to address these needs, and found solutions, as described at the beginning of this section.

Conclusions

There is evidence that student funding options are insufficient, and that barriers exist for current and potential students. In addition, the IIG may not be making current and potential students sufficiently aware of the financial options that are available to students, and the importance of applying for funding as early as possible.

Criteria for band funding can be a structural barrier for those students who do not meet the criteria. With insufficient funds, bands are compelled to allocate those funds in accordance with restrictive criteria. Although student loans are an option, this option may not be available for all potential IIG students. The extent to which student funding limits access cannot be known from this evaluation, however. The methodology used in this evaluation does not permit quantifying the extent to which financial barriers to access exist. It cannot determine, for instance, how many potential IIG students would not be able to obtain sufficient funding to complete a program at the IIG.

With the limited resources at hand, the IIG has done an effective job of addressing other access issues-especially for those with disabilities. A dedicated effort to try to eliminate barriers imposed by disabilities when they are identified was evident among non-instructional staff, instructors and administrators. However, non-instructional staff were not sufficiently knowledgeable of the resources available to assist students with special needs, such as the Adult Services Project of Special Education Technology-BC.

The need to provide more emotional support for students has been identified by students. Although the IIG has made an effort to meet this need in the past, their ability to adequately address this need is limited by its resources. Budget cutbacks have resulted in the loss of a half-time professional counsellor, who was available in 1996/97 to provide emotional support for Vancouver students. Extension students have no support at all.

The IIG's Vancouver location is adequate for the short term, but there are problems with the location, especially the high cost of living in Vancouver, which may be a barrier to access. Although providing extension programming can overcome the problems associated with living in Vancouver, extension students do not have access to the supports available to Vancouver students.

3. Operations

Included in this chapter are findings on the issues relating to the physical and financial resources of the IIG, as well as those on monitoring, evaluation and reporting.

3.1 Physical Resources

Issue: ***Does the IIG have adequate physical resources, including facilities, office and classroom space and the technology infrastructure, needed to carry out its Mission? Does the IIG have effective processes for maintaining and building its physical resources as required to carry out its Mission?***[23]

The facilities of the IIG are described in the second chapter. Since September, 1997, the IIG has been occupying four floors of an office building in Gastown. It has been sharing one of these floors with the library of the UBCIC. The UBCIC has been occupying the top floor of the building and retail businesses have been occupying the main floor of the building. A description of the IIG's physical resources, as they were in the Fall of 1997, follows.

The IIG has been using the library owed by the UBCIC. The UBCIC has built up the collection over a number of years. The library contains archival material relevant to Indigenous government issues and a few computers for research use. Other than an acquisition budget to meet the library needs of the UBCIC and insurance costs, the IIG has been paying all costs of operating the library since the fall of 1995. At the time of data collection, the library was serving a wide range of people in addition to the IIG students. Because of its small size and the large number of people using the library, it has not been suitable as quiet study space. Study space in the library was removed to add additional shelving for the collection. The former classrooms on the third floor were being used for study space.

The IIG's computer lab has been able to accommodate a maximum of 12 students at a time. Classrooms have been set up so that students can sit in a circle, but when the classes are at the maximum of 29 students, this has not been possible. A full class has also meant that students cannot be spaced apart during exams, unless some can be moved to another room. None of the classrooms were designed as classrooms and hence they have not been completely suitable. The two rooms on the third floor that were used as classrooms in the first two years, were only used when absolutely necessary in the third year, as they are small and one has had a problem with noise from the ventilation system. The student lounge has been in an area on the third floor.

The IIG installed a special needs computer and reader on the second floor during the Fall 1997 semester. The basement, where the computer lab was until the end of 1997, and where the offices of instructors have been located since the fall of 1996, is not wheelchair

[23] Issue 3.4 of the Research Plan.

accessible, as the elevator does not go below the main floor. For this reason, the computer lab was moved to the second floor at the end of 1997. The front of the building is also not wheelchair accessible; wheelchair access has been provided through a back door.

For the extension sites, the IIG has rented classroom space in the local community. Saanich extension has been delivered at the Adult Education Centre of the Saanich Indian School Board. The building, which has two floors, but no elevator, was bought from Camosun College for one dollar and moved to the site. Since then, it has housed the administration offices, classrooms and a computer lab for the Adult Education Centre. Lillooet extension has been delivered in a variety of locations. Originally, a room at a local church was rented by the IIG to use as a classroom. Later, to save money, a room in the band office was used. A computer lab at the local secondary school was used for the computer course. The IIG has not made arrangements for library privileges for IIG extension students at local libraries in either extension community.

Respondents' Views

All employees, members of the Board, students and government stakeholders were asked whether they thought the IIG had adequate physical resources, including office, library, classroom and study space, heating, lighting and other aspects of the building, and technology and learning resources, to meet its needs. The general view expressed by the IIG's non-instructional staff, administrators and instructors was that, after moving into the second floor, the IIG has adequate space for the immediate future. The library collection was viewed as an excellent resource, although respondents reported that it has been running out of space for its collection.

Although the respondents who work for the IIG generally thought that the physical resources were adequate for the time being, there were a number of shortcomings of the physical resources that they commented upon. Their concerns are summarized here:

- classrooms were too crowded; only 2 rooms on the second floor could accommodate the maximum class size of 29 and would not hold more than 20 students comfortably; the computer lab could only hold 12 students;
- there was not enough quiet study space for students; the library was too small and too busy for this use; students often did not have quiet study space at home;
- the library was running out of room to expand the collection;
- extension sites did not have adequate library resources and the IIG had not established lending privileges with libraries in extension communities;
- there was not enough library staff to meet all needs; library hours were limited and staff did not have enough time to keep up with cataloguing new material;
- learning resources were adequate for the associate of arts degree, but would not be for the baccalaureate degree;

- the IIG did not have technology for distance education;
- there were some ventilation and/or heating problems; and
- there needed to be more thought to space planning; job function and what people physically do in their offices have not been considered in assigning office space.

Two of the five government stakeholders who were asked about the adequacy of the physical resources did not have an opinion, and the others had mixed views. Two thought the physical resources were adequate, but one of these thought the building was barely adequate as it was not designed for this purpose, hence it was not an ideal learning environment. The fifth respondent thought that the building was inadequate as a student facility in particular, its classrooms and study space were not adequate, and there was no social lounge, cafeteria or room for expansion. In addition, this respondent thought that learning resources were a problem since there was no co-operative arrangement with any other post-secondary educational institution regarding library privileges for IIG students.

Student's views were obtained in the focus groups and through the survey. For the survey, students were asked how satisfied they were "with the facilities for students, such as classroom, library and study space, computer and library resources." Satisfaction ratings are provided in Table 3-1. The average ratings for Vancouver and Lillooet students were in the moderately satisfied range. The average for students in Saanich, however, was in the moderately unsatisfied range.

TABLE 3-1
Student's Average Satisfaction Ratings with Physical Resources

Campus	Average Rating *
Vancouver Campus	
Focus Groups (n = 21)	5.0
Non-focus Groups (n =14)	5.6
Overall (n = 35)	5.3
Saanich Campus	
Focus Groups (n = 5)	3.1
Non-focus Groups (n = 6)	3.0
Overall (n = 11)	3.1
Lillooet Campus	
Focus Groups (n = 2) **	3.0
Non-focus Groups (n = 6)	5.2
Overall (n = 8)	6.4

* A seven-point rating scale was used, with 1 = extremely unsatisfied, and 7 = extremely satisfied.
** With only two respondents, this average should be interpreted with caution

Vancouver students were satisfied in general with physical resources. The concerns that they expressed regarding facilities were:

- library resources were good, but the library and computer lab were too small;
- the library hours were too short and there was not enough library staff;
- study space was inadequate;
- classrooms were cramped;
- the elevator was slow and doors to the stair wells were kept locked; and
- there were no windows in classrooms.

Students who had left the IIG before completing their program were generally satisfied with the facilities, although a few thought the classrooms were crowded.

The two Lillooet students who participated in the focus groups were more negative than were the other students who completed surveys. They were satisfied with classroom space, but expressed concerns over lack of library resources and one student had some difficulty getting access to a computer to complete assignments.

Saanich students in the focus groups thought that classroom and study space was adequate, but had concerns that there was no lighting outside at night and there was no elevator, making access for elders a challenge. They were also concerned that the Internet had not been hooked up for the computer course;[24] and they did not have access to the computer lab after 7:30 on weekdays or on weekends. Saanich students also thought that students were limited in what research they could do because of inadequate library facilities.

Conclusions

The IIG does have adequate physical resources at its Vancouver location, including office and classroom space as well as computer and library resources, for the short term. Physical resources at the extension sites in Saanich and Lillooet have not been in the IIG's direct control. The dissatisfaction expressed by extension students with these resources reflects the challenges the IIG has in delivering extension programming. This is discussed more in the next section, *Financial Resources*.

With respect to the Vancouver campus, the IIG is not able to make the most efficient use of its space, in part because the building was not designed for use as an educational institution. Only the basement floor was actually designed for the IIG. The other floors are being used with only minor modifications. As a consequence, there are rooms that, at the

[24] Saanich had agreed to provide internet hook-up but there were delays in getting this accomplished.

time of writing, are unused or used only infrequently, while other rooms are crowded. Even though it has unused space, there are logistical problems in using the space optimally. For instance, since the basement is not wheelchair accessible, the room in the basement that was the computer lab cannot be used as a classroom. Even if the IIG can use all the available space, though, it will have difficulty accommodating the growth expected within two or three years.

3.2 Financial Resources

*Issue: **Are funding mechanisms appropriate given the mission and plan for the IIG? If not, what would be more appropriate? Does the IIG have the necessary resources to continue implementing the IIG according to the original plan and consistent with its Mission? Are course fees appropriate? Are fees collected in a timely fashion? Does the IIG have effective mechanisms for obtaining corporate and other donations?***[25]

The funding mechanisms for the IIG are outlined in Chapter 1. For the first three years, from 1995 until March 31 1998, the IIG had funding from both the federal and provincial government through the Strategic Initiatives. Thereafter, the only funding mechanisms in place at the time of writing were tuition, fundraising donations and provincial funding based on the FTE enrollment.

Information on the financial status of the IIG, including financial resources, revenue options and tuition, was collected from documents and from interviews with IIG administrators. Information on the IIG's financial resources are reported first. Later in this section the views of administrators, as well as other respondents, that pertain to the financial issues are presented.

Financial Resources During the Period of Strategic Initiative Funding

The Strategic Initiatives (SI) Agreement between the Province of BC and the government of Canada provided for matching contributions from the provincial and federal governments for the IIG, from 1995/96 to 1997/98, totalling $4.98 million. SI funding for the final year (1997/98) of the agreement was $1,891,950. The only other significant revenue source was tuition revenue.

As reported in the previous chapter about implementation difficulties, the IIG has experienced some financial problems. There appears to be a number of factors that have contributed to the IIG's financial difficulties. The chief financial officer of the IIG is the bursar. In the first year, the IIG had two bursars.[26] The third bursar was hired at the beginning of the second year. At that point, the financial records of the IIG were inadequate to allow for effective monitoring of the financial status of the institution. It was

---

25 Issue 3.5 of the Research Plan.

26 The second bursar was appointed on an interim basis pending a search for a permanent replacement when the first bursar left during the first year.

not until the spring of that year that an accurate financial picture of the IIG emerged, after the bursar had implemented an improved system for tracking expenditures. The fact that enrollments were significantly below projection for the first two years, also meant that tuition revenue has been below projections for each year.

When the IIG realized that is was in a deficit situation for the 1996/97 fiscal year, it approached the Ministry for additional funding near the end of its second fiscal year, in early March 1997. They requested a total of $243,302, for pension costs, a severance settlement, computer systems development and operating expenses associated with their lease, in order to balance the budget for the fiscal period ending on March 31 1997. This request was turned down because, except for a small portion, the Ministry thought that the costs had been provided for in the IIG's annual operating grant, since *"all the costs are considered part of the regular business of the Institute and should have been budgeted for as part of [the IIG's] ongoing operations."*[27] The IIG pursued the issue of additional funding with the Deputy Minister at a meeting on May 1, 1997. On the agenda for the meeting was, among other items, funding for prior learning assessment and capital costs. The Ministry did not provide the additional funding that was requested. The IIG did not receive any additional funds to cover the needed $243,302 for the 1996/97 fiscal year.

The IIG recognized that it was not possible to balance the budget for the third fiscal year (the 1997/98 year) without making some cutbacks. The final decisions on what cutbacks to make was made by the Board in late June, 1997. The cutbacks involved a reorganization of the IIG and the elimination of three non-teaching positions. At the same time, expansion of the extension program was put on hold and the Lillooet extension site was also put on hold due to lower than necessary enrollments.

The budget cutbacks made in June 1997 were not enough to balance the budget for the 1997/98 fiscal period. As of December 1997, the IIG needed to reduce its expenditures by $150,000 and raise $60,000 in donations in order to balance its budget for the 1997/98 fiscal year. As of January 1998, the IIG was in the process of reviewing the budget to try to find the necessary savings. There have been a number of reasons for these budget difficulties. On the revenue side, the 1997/98 budget included revenue expected from fundraising of $175,000, but no systematic fundraising had been undertaken by the IIG. (The finance committee of the Board received direction from the Board in August 1997 to develop a fundraising strategy, and has been working on developing this strategy.)

On the expenditure side, the 1997/98 budget approved by the Board in June 1997 did not include the rent for the second floor, into which the IIG expanded in September 1997. Although the IIG had entered into an agreement to lease the second floor prior to June 1997, when their financial difficulties became apparent, the IIG tried to get out of the commitment to lease the second floor, but this was not possible. The extension program has also gone over budget, partly because of the cost of instructors travelling to the sites, and partly because extension classes were offered in Lillooet for the fall 1997 semester,

---

[27] Letter from Tom Austin, Director, Post Secondary Finance and Information Management Branch, April 2, 1997.

although they had not been planned in the budget because enrollment was less than the criteria.

Future Financial Resources

With the end of the SI Agreement on March 31 1998, the IIG will no longer have the federal portion of its funding. The IIG has developed a projected "worst case" budget scenario for the 1998-99 fiscal year, based on the assumption that enrollment for the year will be 140 FTEs. The revenue and expenditure amounts for this budget scenario are presented in Table 3-2.

TABLE 3-2
Expenditures for the 1998/99 "Worst Case" Budget Scenario

Expenditure Category	Expenses*	Subtotals
Education Programs:		
Main Campus	674,695.82	
Extension	221,122.49	
International	37,083.88	
Calendar	33,000.00	
Subtotal		965,902.19
Educational Support:		
Library	145,000.00	
Student Development	110,835.82	
Subtotal		255,835.82
Administration:		
President's Office	170,774.75	
Bursar's Office	266,511.07	
Registrar's Office	95,030.41	
Audit/legal	39,000.00	
Subtotal		571,316.23
Operations and supplies:		
Computer Services	60,075.00	
Logistical	172,809.10	
Subtotal		232,884.10
Facilities	362,108.65	362,108.65
Board of Governors	59,800.00	59,800.00
Total		$2,447,847.00

Comments on expenditure categories in Table 3-2:

- Expenditures for the education program at the Vancouver main campus includes the Dean of Academics, and the Dean's executive assistant, and all instructors for the main campus. Total salaries and benefits included in this category are $644,195.82, representing 95% of expenditures.

- Expenditures for the extension program includes the Director of Extension and all instructors for extension sites. Since full-time faculty can teach on the extension campuses, their salaries have been prorated between the Main Campus and Extension Programs, based on the amount of teaching full-time faculty will be doing at the extension sites. Total salaries and benefits included in this category are $177,872.49, representing 80% of expenditures. Travel of $14,000.00 is also included in this category. In addition, honoraria for local elders and rental of classroom space is included.

- Student services includes honoraria and travel for elders on the main campus. Since elders are from different communities in British Columbia, the IIG must cover their travel between their home community and the IIG.

- The amount in the library category is the amount paid to the UBCIC for the use of the UBCIC's library. This amount was negotiated with the UBCIC to cover the cost of a head librarian and one assistant. The amount also includes a budget for library acquisitions for the IIG.

- The registrar's category includes the costs for graduation ceremonies.

- Facilities includes rental of the main premises in Vancouver, as well as the accounting office on a reserve in North Vancouver. An accounting office on reserve land is needed to issue payroll in order to meet Revenue Canada regulations so that status Indians are not required to pay federal income tax. Facilities also includes utilities, janitorial and security services.

- Expenditures in the Board category includes honoraria for Board members, travel and accommodation costs for attending Board meetings and rental of space for Board meetings. Board meetings are held on reserve land to meet Revenue Canada regulations pertaining to the tax-except status of status Indians.

- The logistics category includes office supplies used throughout the Institution, rental and service of office equipment, telephones, advertising, etc. It also includes salaries for general clerical support.

- The computer services category pertains to computer support for both instruction and administration.

The expenditure amounts have been based on the 1997-98 budget. The only increases pertain to salaries; salary increments already planned have been included in the scenario. There have been no additional staff except for the necessary sessional instructors required to deliver courses for the anticipated 140 FTE students. The teaching needs for this scenario have been determined by assuming that full-time faculty would be teaching full course loads, that there would be an average of 15 students per class and that the number of courses taught in Saanich and Lillooet would be the same as for the previous year. As can be seen from Table 3-2, expenditures are $2,447,847 in the scenario. This amount is only to deliver the current programs; it assumes no expansion of the extension program and no implementation of the four-year program.

The revenue of $1,535,000 included in the scenario is based on the following assumptions:

- The Ministry of Education, Skills and Training will provide IIG with the same funding as they have for the 1997/98 year: $940,000.
- As there is no funding agreement with the federal government following March 31, 1998, no federal funding is included in the scenario.
- Tuition and fees are based on the assumption that there will be 140 FTE students, who will pay on average $3,000 each, yielding revenue of $420,000.
- IIG will raise, through fundraising efforts, $175,000.

The difference between revenue and expense amounts in the budget scenario is a shortfall of $912,847, which is 37% of expenditures. The loss of the federal funding that the IIG had for the 1997-98 fiscal year represents 38% of total revenue, if the federal funding were included in the total revenue that is anticipated for the IIG for the 1998/99 fiscal period.

The President and the Academic Dean began discussions with the Ministry in the Fall of 1997, with the goal of negotiating additional funding for the 1998/99 fiscal year, by presenting these "worst case" budget figures to the Deputy Minister and the Assistant Deputy Ministry. The Ministry and the IIG have reached agreement on the principles for negotiating funding for the IIG in the Fall of 1997. The principles are presented in Exhibit 3-1. Discussions around the specifics of funding for the IIG are expected to take place during the winter and spring of 1998.

EXHIBIT 3-1
Principles for Negotiation of IIG Funding*

1. Pursuant to section 8(iv) of the Agreement dated June 9, 1997, between the Province of British Columbia and the Union of BC Indian Chiefs which states that "in fiscal years 1998/99 and 1999/2000, the IIG will receive from the Province funding consistent with that provided to other post-secondary institutions under the **College and Institute Act**", implementation of section 8(iv) will reflect:
   a) the unique mission and character of the IIG is that it is an Aboriginal institution established to provide specialised programs of post-secondary education and training to ensure effective self-government.
   b) the continuing development requirements of the IIG as a new institution in years 4 and 5 (1998/99 and 1999/2000).
   c) goals and policies contained in "Charting A New Course" and the "Aboriginal Post-Secondary Education and Training Policy Framework."
   d) the overall performance of the IIG since start-up in improving access for Aboriginal learners and developing and delivering culturally-relevant, high-quality curriculum.
2. The IIG and the UBCIC will use its best efforts in co-operation with the Ministry of Education, Skill and Training (MEST) to secure the participation of the Federal Government in funding the IIG on an annual and/or multi-year basis.
3. MEST funding for the IIG will be provided in the form "consistent with that provided to other post-secondary institutions under the **College and Institute Act**" and will reflect the characteristics of the IIG and policy environment as identified in paragraph 1.
4. The IIG will provide audited enrollment reports, audited accounts and financial statements and other reports in a manner consistent with other post-secondary institutions under the **College and Institute Act**.

* From a letter from Shell Harvey, Assistant Deputy Minister, to the IIG Interim President, Grand Chief Bernard Charles, December 9, 1997.

Revenue Options

As with any post-secondary institution, the revenue options open to the IIG include government support, tuition, and donations. There is also the potential to generate revenue through selling advertising space in calendars, and by entering into service contracts to provide special training programs.

The main source of funding for the IIG has been government funding. For its first three years, only funding through the Strategic Initiatives program has been provided. The IIG has not participated in the usual funding process that the Ministry applies to other provincial post-secondary institutions. Hence, it has no direct experience with how this process would be applied to the IIG. The existing funding sources, through the federal and provincial governments, that are potentially available to the IIG are described here.

- Ministry funding provided to post-secondary institutions through the Post-Secondary Division: In April 1998, the Ministry will begin phased implementation of the funding framework outlined in *Charting a New Course*. This new funding framework consists

of a series of inter-related funding envelopes, and is intended to have the flexibility to accommodate changes in education priorities. The Basic Operating Grant Envelope will comprise the largest portion and will fund a base level of service, including core operations, student services, administration, equipment replacement and program delivery. The key elements of the Basic Operating Grant are:

— The Core Funding Block, which will provide for basic operations, including fixes costs such as physical plant, regardless of institutional size or location.

— The Operations Support Funding Block will provide for the semi-fixed costs, such as library, counselling, admissions, operations and equipment replacements. This block will also recognize additional costs associated with delivery of services away from the main campus.

— The Student Funding Block will provide for all variable costs which relate to the delivery of educational programming and student instruction. It will consist of a Student Funding component, with allocation expressed in terms of numbers of full-time equivalents approved for an institution, which will be derived through the Full Time Equivalent Allocation Model, the Program Planning and Rationalization Model and the Program Profile Process. Another component of the Student Funding Block is Performance-Based Funding, which will recognize institutions that meet targets for student spaces and levels of access and performance objectives for learner support and retention, particularly for high-risk and non-traditional learners. The third component of the Student Funding Block is Special Program Funding, which will be used to implement emerging government and system priorities as they relate to educational programming and student instruction. This could include targeted funds to support Aboriginal initiatives in the institution.

- The Field Services and Aboriginal Education Branch of the Ministry administers funding programs that are relevant to the IIG. Funding is available for Aboriginal education co-ordinators to facilitate student access and provide liaison between the institution and Aboriginal communities. Grants are also available for partnership programs between Aboriginal Institutions and public post-secondary institutions. This could include off-campus delivery programming.

- The federal government, through the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, can provide project funding under the Indian Studies Support Program.

Tuition

Tuition is the other source of revenue for the IIG. Tuition revenue is determined by enrollment levels and tuition fees. The IIG set their fees at $300 for a 3 credit course, after reviewing the fees of other colleges and finding that the average was $250 for a 3 credit course; since IIG's costs for delivering the program were expected to be higher, they set tuition higher than the average. When the third bursar took over and was improving the IIG's record keeping systems, he discovered that there were cases where tuition for the

previous year had not been paid. The system has been changed since then, so that accounting information reconciles with the student registration system, to ensure that this will not happen in the future.

Respondents' Views on Financial Resources

The IIG administrators were asked whether the IIG had the financial resources needed to meet the goals in its five-year plan. All six administrators thought that the IIG did not have sufficient funding to support the growth required to meet its goals in the five-year plan. A summary of the reasons they offered for why financial resources were not adequate follow:

- government funding levels in the SI Agreement were not based on need;
- funding in the SI Agreement did not cover capital costs for the building, equipment or technology;
- because of the small size of the IIG, it did not have economies of scale; and
- funding was not enough to implement extension properly.

IIG administrators were also asked what financial resources were needed and what plans were in place for future funding. According to administrators, there were no firm plans in place for future funding, but possibilities were being explored. Their responses regarding the financial needs of the IIG are summarized below:

- the IIG needs to increase FTEs through recruitment;
- funds are needed to develop and implement distance education programs, including technology to provide remote instruction;
- funds are needed to provide support to extension students, including library resources, elders and counsellors and student development support;
- the IIG needs to partner to share infrastructure costs;
- funds are needed to establish scholarships; and
- about $200,000 will be needed to implement the four year program, including costs for curriculum development, as well as for delivery of instruction.

Administrators offered the following suggestions for what could be done regarding the IIG's financial situation:

- Look for ways to reduce expenditures, such as: producing the calendar for less money ($33,000 is budgeted for 1998/98 the IIG calendar whereas Nicola Valley Institute of Technology (NVIT) spends $7,000 on their calendar); re-negotiating contracts with

suppliers for office equipment; partnering to share infrastructure costs; partnering with Community Skills Centres or other agencies to deliver distance education.

- Find ways to raise revenue, including selling advertising in the calendar, providing continuing education courses.

- Increase recruitment efforts to increase enrollment; this will increase both tuition revenue and funding through the FTE funding formula.

- Seek out additional sources of government funding, such as the Department of Indian Affairs and the British Columbia Aboriginal Ministry, using the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples as the rationale for increasing government funding for Aboriginal education.[28]

- Lobby the Department of Indian Affairs to improve student funding for post-secondary education.

In addition to government funding, donations through fundraising initiatives are possible sources of revenue for the IIG. Administrators acknowledged that very little had been done in the area of fundraising, but fundraising possibilities were being explored.

The seven Board members who were interviewed (including the faculty representative to the Board) believed that the IIG did not have the necessary financial resources to meet its goals in the five-year plan. The primary reason respondents offered for viewing the resources as inadequate was that the IIG was having difficulties with its finances and did not have sufficient resources to address all its needs. Five of the seven Board respondents were aware that the IIG had not carried out systematic fundraising activities. Board respondents did not know what plans were in place for future funding for the IIG after the SI funding ends, or what funding options exist.

---

28 The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples makes the following recommendation with respect to Aboriginal education (Recommendation 3.5.2 of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, 1996):

Federal, provincial and territorial governments collaborate with Aboriginal governments, organisations or education authorities, as appropriate, to support the development of Aboriginally controlled education systems by:

(a) introducing, adapting or ensuring the flexible application of legislation to facilitate self-starting initiatives by Aboriginal nations and their communities in the field of education;

(b) mandating voluntary organisations that are endorsed by substantial numbers of Aboriginal people to act in the field of education in urban and non-reserve areas where numbers warrant until such time as Aboriginal governments are established; and

(c) providing funding commensurate with the responsibilities assumed by Aboriginal nations and their communities, or voluntary organisations, given the requirements of institutional and program development, costs of serving small or dispersed communities, and special needs accruing from past failures of education services.

The specific concerns of Board respondents, related to the financial resources of the IIG, were:

- the Strategic Initiative funding was based on thinking of the IIG as a project; the IIG needs stable long term funding so long term planning can be done;
- salaries at the top of the IIG have been too high;
- the IIG has not been achieving its projected enrollments;
- the IIG has been needing to look for other sources of funding, including the federal government;
- DIA has not been providing enough funding for aboriginal post-secondary education to meet the needs for student and institutional funding;
- the IIG has been needing money for student scholarships;
- fundraising has been a slow process, as the IIG is not well known and has not established connections; and
- the Board had been slow to make fundraising a priority; the fundraising committee has been developing a fundraising plan, but has not known what options are realistic.

Five government stakeholders were asked how feasible they thought it was for the IIG to carryout its five-year plan given the available funding over the five years. They were also asked whether the usual Ministry funding formulas would be appropriate to meet the needs of the IIG after the SI funding ends. Two government stakeholders thought it was feasible for the IIG to deliver its five-year plan with the funding; one of these two respondents assumed that the agreement between the government and the IIG provided for a realistic plan, hence the funding must be adequate. On the other hand, all five expressed some concerns over the financial viability of the IIG once it must rely on formula funding, since small institutions don't fit the funding formula well. Specific concerns expressed by government stakeholders regarding the finances of the IIG were:

- the IIG had overspent as they had been a little ambitious and had not appeared to have experience in running an education institution;
- the IIG had taken start-up costs and built them into ongoing operational costs and will have a problem when SI funding ends;
- the IIG had not yet addressed how they would operate with the reduced funding; and
- the IIG would need special grants to supplement the FTE funding, but continued reliance on special grants causes questions of credibility with other institutions.

Ten respondents (government and other stakeholders, and the member of the UBCIC) were asked for fundraising suggestions, and six government stakeholders were asked for other funding options for the IIG. The suggestions offered are provided in Appendix C.

Respondents' Views on Tuition

Tuition is the other source of revenue for the IIG. Administrators all thought that IIG's course fees were comparable to other colleges. IIG instructors and non-instructional staff also expressed the view that the fees were appropriate, although a number of instructors could not comment because they did not know how the IIG's fees compared to those of other institutions.

Although the majority of students thought that IIG's course fees were appropriate and were comparable with other colleges, a sizeable minority (39%) of all the students who participated in focus groups were concerned that the fees were too high. A few suggested that $200 per course would be more appropriate. Some pointed out that other colleges had lower fees, and the other colleges were better known than the IIG and had credit transfer arrangements in place, implying that the fees at other colleges were a better value.

Members of the four communities where focus groups were conducted generally thought that the IIG's fees were appropriate, although some were concerned that the fees were higher than those of other institutions.

Conclusions

There are two aspects of the IIG's mandate that are unique:

- it is to deliver a specialized, culturally relevant curriculum on Indigenous government studies; and
- in a learning environment that supports the needs of Aboriginal students-needs that have not been met in traditional mainstream educational institutions.

This unique mandate means that the IIG has a number of specific characteristics that need to be considered when determining appropriate funding levels. Students at the IIG need the same access to student support services that a traditional post-secondary institute would provide, such as education and career counsellors, library resources, etc. In addition, though, IIG must provide its students with other supports not typically found in mainstream institutions. These additional supports include:

- resident elders to bring Indigenous philosophy and cultural values into the institution;
- personal counsellors who can deal with some of the traumatic effects of being part of a marginalized group; as well as;

- academic support programs to deal with the *"special needs accruing from past failures of education services."*[29]

These additional supports are unique characteristics of the IIG, and need to be addressed in the funding mechanisms for the IIG. Even the library resource needs extend beyond the typical post-secondary resources, in that students need access to in-depth material relevant to Indigenous government issues in addition to the usual resources needed at a post-secondary institution. As indicated in the section on physical resources, the UBCIC's library has a collection that is unique with respect to in-depth material relevant to indigenous government issues, but, due to financial limitations, it may not fully meet the resource needs in other subject areas.

Another characteristic of the IIG that is causing financial challenges is its mandate to provide a high proportion of extension programming. One of the situational barriers to access to post-secondary education for Aboriginal people is geographic distance from post-secondary centres. Strong ties to family and community are aspects of Aboriginal culture that make relocation an undesirable alternative for many. The *Aboriginal Post-Secondary Education and Training Policy Framework* has identified that community-based development and delivery systems are needed to improve Aboriginal access to post-secondary education. The IIG's extension and distance education programs have the potential to improve access. These methods of delivery add extra costs to the IIG. Since Aboriginal people often live in small and dispersed communities throughout British Columbia, identifying a cost-effective method of delivering a community-based program will be a challenge.

An extension program has the extra challenges of:

- Travel costs of bringing instructors to the students: Instructors have generally travelled to extension sites from the IIG's Vancouver location. Hence the same course costs more money to deliver at an extension site than its does on the Vancouver campus.

- Costs of providing support to extension students: Extension students need the same support as do students on the main campus, i.e., access to library resources, elders, counsellors and academic and study skills upgrading.

- Additional communication and infrastructure costs: Communication includes long distance costs of communication between instructors and students, as well as between administration and students. It also includes the transmission of student records and documents. Other infrastructure costs could include on-site administration to facilitate the transfer of information between the extension students and the main campus.

- Diseconomies of scale: Extension sites will typically have only a fraction of the number of students as would be found on the main campus. Yet the above costs will exist, making the costs of delivery per extension FTE higher than the cost of delivering per FTE on the main campus.

---

29 Recommendation 3.5.2 of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, 1996. See footnote on page 49.

Alternative methods of delivering, such as use of the Internet, and electronic classroom, can reduce or even eliminate some of the above costs, but an infrastructure (access to the Internet and/or electronic classroom in communities) is needed before these methods of delivery are feasible. To be effective, however, any distributed method of instruction must ensure the quality of the education does not suffer with the alternative method of delivery, and must have some method of providing student support, such as access to elders, counsellors and library services.

The funding of the IIG is a complex issue. The people involved in delivering the IIG clearly believe that their funding is inadequate, even for the third year, and feel that increased funding in the future is needed if the IIG is to fully implement its five-year plan. On the other hand, the IIG has found ways to reduce its costs and still deliver the program. And there are probably other savings that can be found, such as producing a less expensive calendar. The contract with the UBCIC to provide library services to the IIG is another area that could be examined; this contract covers the full cost of staffing the library, yet the UBCIC library does not just serve the IIG, it serves the larger Aboriginal community.

What is missing from this analysis is concrete information on how much it should cost to deliver the IIG and how the money could be most effectively used. As was mentioned earlier in this report, the IIG is the first institution of its kind. As an independent, degree-granting institution with a specialized program of Indigenous government studies, it is unique. Hence, models of how to deliver this kind of program, and the associated costs, do not exist. A cost-benefit analysis was not part of the scope of this evaluation, nor was it possible to do any rigorous costing when the original funding agreement was negotiated. When the IIG was established, there was no time to carry out research to identify the most cost effective structure and method of delivery, nor were there any models on which to rely. As is inevitable without a model to guides its development, the IIG has been evolving on an ad hoc basis; when the IIG management has identified problems, they have tried alternatives. Three years gives very little time to "evolve" the right structure, especially when this is done through a process of trial and error. A three-year budget of the size of the IIG's can not easily accommodate many mistakes. Hence the reason for the IIG's financial difficulties now.

Although the Strategic Initiatives Agreement specifies that it will take five years for the IIG to complete its development, only three years of developmental funding is provided. This funding fails to recognize that there will continue to be additional developmental costs during the next two years. Some of these additional costs are due to the need to spend time developing programs and curriculum for the four-year program, as well as continuing to develop administration policies and procedures and to expand its structure as its programs expand. Additional funding is also needed during this period because enrollment numbers have not yet reached optimum levels. In fact, it may be some time before optimum numbers are achieved, especially for third and fourth year courses. It is also not clear what constitutes an "optimum" level. From the IIG's perceptive, optimum is the largest size of class that can be taught using methods that are compatible with indigenous culture. Optimum class size, in the view of the IIG, is in the range of twelve to fifteen students, with a maximum of 29 students. When considered solely from a cost-efficiency point of view, 29 students per class is low.

Some government stakeholders realize the challenge that the IIG's small size causes for funding, but few seem to have considered other characteristics of the IIG that have an impact on financial need, which were not adequately reflected in the original funding for the IIG.

In conclusion, funding mechanisms for the IIG are not fully appropriate to the mission and plan of the IIG. Funding mechanisms do not adequately provide for further developmental costs, nor do they adequately address the extra costs of providing extension and distance delivery, or the additional student supports needed. As a specialized program targeting a specialized audience, the IIG will always be small compared to institutions that provide a more general education to a more general audience. Due to all these differences, funding mechanisms must, therefore, recognize that the per FTE costs of the IIG will be, by necessity, higher than the per FTE costs for a typical post-secondary institution. There is no good information, however, to adequately determine how much higher these costs should be. With time, and careful monitoring and planning, the IIG should be able to determine what these costs should be.

Government funding is not the only source of funding for the IIG. Donations and tuition are the other two major sources of funding for any post-secondary institution. The IIG's tuition revenue is tied to its success in recruitment and its fee structure. There is no evidence that course fees are limiting its revenue, since the IIG's fees are higher than the average fees of other colleges and institutes. The fact that enrollment is lower than anticipated has already been discussed. IIG's success in increasing their tuition revenue is directly related to their success in recruiting students. We have already seen indications of improvement in this area (see Chapter 2), although current financial difficulties and associated cutbacks in travel for recruitment may reduce the future effectiveness of recruitment, both for extension and for the Vancouver campus.

Fundraising to solicit donations to the IIG is an area of weakness. At the time of writing, the IIG had not developed effective mechanisms for obtaining donations. The importance of developing and implementing a fundraising strategy was not recognized by the Board until the end of its second year. On the other hand, the IIG has not had time to develop its fundraising potential; there are no alumni from whom to solicit donations, the IIG is relatively new, and hence is not well known and has had limited time to establish its credibility. The most likely supporters of the IIG are the future employers of its graduates, First Nation communities. Aboriginal nations do not have money and are focused on their own economic issues, such as land claims issues. Other supporters will need to be developed, but it takes time to raise awareness and time for IIG to establish credibility with potential supporters.

The IIG management has not been proactive in addressing its funding needs. The little action taken on fundraising, just discussed, is one example. In addition, they did not seek additional government funding until March 1997, when they realized that the IIG was operating with a deficit. They had also not researched what other funding options were available, such as support, for which they are eligible, from the Field Services and

Aboriginal Education Branch of the Ministry. By its own admission,[30] the IIG had failed to adequately budget for normal operating costs, such as pension contributions. The IIG has also made decisions without considering their financial impact, such as expanding into the second floor.

Admittedly, the IIG has faced many challenges that have likely had an impact on its ability to plan adequately for its financial needs. As already mentioned, the IIG is unique and has had no model upon which to base its design and budget. Funding conditions only allowed nine weeks at the beginning for planning and development of the IIG, which has meant that administrators have had many demands that have competed for their attention. The most pressing demands associated with implementing the IIG, of program and curriculum development and student recruitment took priority over financial planning and monitoring. The high turnover of staff, especially of key administrators, including the bursar, registrar and president, and the lack of effective systems for monitoring expenditures, probably also had a role to play in the ability of the IIG to plan adequately for its financial needs.

3.3 Reporting, Monitoring and Evaluation

Issue: ***Does the IIG have systems that produce reliable and appropriate information to enable management to make appropriate decisions? Is there a process to ensure that records and reports, including admission, retention, completion for both main campus and extension campuses as well as distance education students, are accurate and reliable? Does the IIG have a process in place to collect information on where to locate a student once they leave the IIG? Is there an effective process in place for institutional evaluation to provide accountability to learners and those funding the IIG, and to ensure quality curriculum and teaching?***[31]

Because of its Strategic Initiative funding, the IIG has had unique reporting requirements. It has not had to do the reporting to the Ministry that is normally required of colleges and institutes, such as audited enrollments, program profiles and performance measurement reports. Instead, the IIG has been required to participate in a three stage evaluation process consisting of: evaluation framework (completed January 1997) and a formative evaluation. The primary purpose of the summative evaluation is to assess the outcomes and impacts of the IIG, including the acceptance of the program by stakeholders, achievement of intended outcomes, assessment of secondary impacts and cost effectiveness.

30 See letter to Tom Austin, Director, Post Secondary Finance and Information Management Branch, March 4, 1997.

31 Issues 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4 from the Research Plan are addressed in this section.

The "Evaluation, Monitoring and Reporting Framework for the Institute of Indigenous Government Strategic Initiative" (January 1997) identified the evaluation issues that could be addressed through each of the following five components in the overall evaluation of the IIG:

- formative evaluation of key processes;
- institutional monitoring and tracking processes;
- institutional self-evaluation;
- colleges and institutes student outcomes survey; and
- summative evaluation.

The *Colleges and Institutes Amendment Act* requires institutions to *"plan for and evaluate its programs and operations on an ongoing basis and, on the request for the minister, must report on these matters in a form the minister directs."* The Act also provides the institution's Education Council with an advisory role with regard to evaluation. The Act states that *"the board must seek advice from the education council on the development of educational policy for the following matters: ... (f) evaluation of programs and educational services."* As of January 1998, the IIG did not have an Education Council (see Chapter 4 of this report).

The usual form of evaluation of colleges and institutes is institutional self-evaluation, which is carried out to ensure institutions have effective processes for making use of their resources and to find ways of improving the use of existing resources. Institutional evaluation generally entails ongoing internal review of instructional programs and support services; these reviews provide input into an institutional self-study, which is usually done every five years. The self-study is followed by an external review, by an external team that reports to the institution's Board, to validate the self-study and the effectiveness of the ongoing review process. The purpose of the institutional evaluation process is to provide for:

- effective institutional planning;
- institutional renewal and improvement; and
- accountability to government and the public.

In addition to the institutional evaluation process described above, all colleges and institutes, except the IIG, participate in the BC Colleges and Institutes Student Outcomes Survey that is conducted every year to obtain information from recent graduates on their employment outcomes and their satisfaction with their educational experiences. With only 16 students[32] who have completed a program at the IIG as of December 1997, the IIG has not yet begun to participate in the outcomes study.

The IIG will eventually be expected to have its own institutional self-evaluation process, and to participate in the student outcomes survey. The IIG evaluation framework

[32] The majority of these 16 students were still enrolled at the IIG at the time of writing, working toward the Associate of Arts degree.

recommended that both institutional self-evaluation and the student outcomes survey be incorporated into the overall evaluation of the IIG. The framework also recommended that the IIG implement their own institutional self-evaluation process during the development period of the IIG, since it would address different issues than those addressed in this formative evaluation or in the subsequent summative evaluation, and would, thus, provide useful additional information for program and institutional planning and ongoing improvement as the IIG programs evolve and develop. The IIG did not have an institutional self-evaluation process when this evaluation was conducted.

Although institutional self-evaluation plays an important role in accountability for allocation of public funds, there has been a movement within government as a whole, and the Ministry in particular, for a more comprehensive level of accountability that uses performance measurement as a basis for continual improvement and reporting on effectiveness. To this end, the Ministry, in partnership with the college and institute community, has implemented the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) initiative, which is an annual performance reporting process. The intent is to collect and report on various participation, completion and outcome measures for the system. Some of the information is supplied directly from the institutions and other information is obtained from other sources, such as the Colleges and Institutes Outcome study. Although the IIG is expected to participate in the KPI process, it has not had the reporting capacity to produce the necessary information.

The evaluation framework also recommended necessary outputs for IIG to monitor and track including:

- enrollment statistics;
- retention rates;
- completion rates; and
- length of time to complete program of study.

Moreover, it should be possible to report the above statistics, for each academic year and each program stream (one-year certificate, two-year associates degree, four-year degree), and for various student categories, such as age and gender. In addition, the evaluation and monitoring framework report recommended a tracking mechanism to follow students after they leave the IIG should be developed so that student follow-up research can be conducted in the future.

The IIG does not have students sign a form allowing the IIG to release the student's name and other information for the purposes of evaluating the IIG. For this evaluation, the IIG had to mail a request to all IIG students, including former students, to ask them to sign a release form so their names could be given to the evaluators. This process will have to be repeated every time an evaluation is carried out, and before the IIG can provide information on their students for the Colleges and Institutes Outcome study, unless the IIG changes their procedures to have students sign the release at the time of registration, as do other institutions.

As has been discussed earlier, the IIG began without adequate systems for student and financial records. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the bursar had implemented a system for tracking expenditures by the Spring of 1997. In the summer of 1997, the IIG began implementing a student record software package called *"Class Act"*. This system is being implemented in modules. The student registration module was the first to be implemented. This was in place for registration for Fall 1997 classes. This system has been able to produce class lists and keep track of student information. At the time of data collection, it could not produce all the required information, though, such as retention rates and had problems producing accurate enrollment data. Its ability to produce student transcripts had not been tested. The next module that was implemented was for student invoicing, which uses registration information to produce tuition invoices for students. The IIG has been working with the software developer to improve the reporting capabilities of the system.

Respondents' Views on Reporting

Members of the IIG Board, administration, employees, and external stakeholders were asked if they were satisfied that the records and reporting procedures of the IIG could provide reliable and appropriate information regarding a) student enrollment, retention, completion and location for later follow-up; and b) financial management.

Five out of six Board members were satisfied that the IIG could provide both reliable student records and financial management records. One Board member elaborated that they received *"very detailed financial records so we can raise [necessary] questions."* One Board member's response was in contrast: *"No, we're not getting enough detail."*

The six administrators responded that the reporting system for finances and student records has improved significantly. One was satisfied that the student record system could meet all needs, and four others were hopeful that it would when completed. Another administrator thought the system met management needs, but did not meet evaluation needs yet. With respect to the financial system, three of the six administrators were not sure, one of the remaining three was satisfied and two thought that significant improvement had been made.

Four of the eight instructors thought that the IIG's student records were reliable and the system had improved greatly. The other four did not know or did not answer the question. One instructor mentioned an earlier problem with student transcripts. Extension students had also suggested this was a problem. At the time of data collection, it was too early to know whether the new system had eliminated the problem with transcripts.

Seven of the eight instructors interviewed were unsure about the IIG's ability to provide reliable financial information. One remaining instructor was satisfied that the financial reporting system provided sufficient information for decision-making.

Four of the six non-instructional staff interviewed were satisfied with financial reporting, and thought that progress had been made in the student reporting system. One respondent attributed problems to the newness of the institute. One respondent was not satisfied with

the student reporting system, and another thought that the financial system had been improved, but more work was needed.

The majority of government stakeholders (4 out of 5) had not seen any IIG reports so could not comment on the reliability of IIG's student and financial reporting process. One government stakeholder was not satisfied with the student record system because the IIG *"had difficulty providing some fundamental information to me about the numbers of students. That's one indicator. They have some challenges in their information management...primarily in meeting government reporting requirements."* This respondent was, however, satisfied with the IIG's financial reporting system.

Respondents' Views on Evaluation

Board members and administrators were asked how the IIG plans to evaluate the quality and relevance of the curriculum and teaching and what plans the IIG has to carry out institutional self-evaluation on an ongoing basis to meet the government accountability requirements. In addition, instructors, elders, and external stakeholders were asked how they would like the IIG to evaluate the quality and relevance of the curriculum and teaching.

When asked how the IIG plans to evaluate the quality and relevance of the curriculum and teaching, IIG administrators answered by discussing what had been done. They described the following aspects of evaluating the IIG's curriculum and teaching:

- students have been doing course evaluations, which are reviewed by the Dean of Academics, and the specific instructor;
- the process of developing curriculum has provided all faculty with an opportunity to provide feedback on the course content;
- curriculum has been reviewed by other post-secondary institutions in the process of negotiating credit transfer agreements;
- informal feedback from other instructors has been provided to instructors;
- formal evaluation of instructors, including peer observation has been conducted periodically; and
- retention and completion rates have been monitored.

Three of the six Board members interviewed did not know how the IIG plans to evaluate the quality and relevance of the curriculum and teaching. The other three offered the following ideas on how curriculum and teaching could be evaluated:

- enrollment, as an indication of relevance;
- student course evaluations;
- peer evaluation of instructors;

- annual review of curriculum by faculty; and
- students success in getting a job.

When asked, the eight instructors and two elders responded with both their views on how the quality and relevance of the curriculum and teaching was being evaluated, as well as their suggestions for what could be done. One of the ten respondents did not know, and two thought there was no process in place and did not offer suggestions. The processes already in place that the six other respondents identified were:

- course evaluation by students;
- self-assessment and the Dean's assessment of instructors;
- peer review of instructors; and
- feedback from faculty, elders and students.

The ideas on how they would like the IIG to evaluate its curriculum and teaching offered by the seven respondents follow:

- have educational outcomes specified by the Education Council;
- review course content;
- find out if students and community leaders are satisfied;
- collect input from communities on their needs;
- examine the academic objectives and relevance to students; and
- have an outside consultant do the evaluation.

Twelve external stakeholders were asked whether they were satisfied that the IIG had a process in place to evaluate its curriculum and teaching that would meet government accountability requirements. Eight did not know, one of the remaining four was satisfied that the Board and Education Council were in place to do this and one did not expect an evaluation process to be in place at this early stage, but suggested that IIG should participate in the Colleges and Institutes Student Outcomes Survey in order to collect employment outcomes within a couple of years. Two other external stakeholders were not satisfied. One of these indicated that there was no Education Council to oversee the evaluation process and the other was critical of IIG's lack of a rigorous process by which they present their curriculum to the outside world. One respondent who did not know whether the IIG had a process, suggested that the process of obtaining credit transfer agreements with other institutions was in itself, a form of evaluation; this stakeholder followed by suggesting the IIG do external reviews by other academics and find some way to ensure accountability to First Nation peoples and communities.

Board members and administrators were also asked what plans the IIG has to carry out institutional self-evaluation on an ongoing basis to meet government accountability requirements. Three of the six Board members did not know. The other three made the following comments:

- the IIG has been planning a two day Board meeting to discuss evaluation and planning;
- self-study would be most effective if done annually, especially during the development stage; the IIG has been watched more closely by both aboriginal and provincial jurisdictions since it is something new and it doesn't fit into any existing model; and
- there have been informal processes to provide feedback to the Board, so they would have heard if there was something wrong.

Only one of the six administrators explicitly stated that there was no self-study in place, but none identified such a process. One administrator did not know, and another thought that this was important but had nothing specific to suggest. The remaining three made the following comments:

- self-study will be formalized in the strategic planning process (2 respondents); to be effective, self-study must be on-going and interconnected with all other management processes (1 of these 2 respondents);
- the IIG is in the process of identifying the *"soft"* evaluation needed for accountability requirements; including budgeting and linking these into a strategic plan.

Conclusions

To improve the reporting capabilities of the IIG, the registrar and the bursar have been implementing (modules of) the *Class Act* information system. Respondents are anticipating that this new system will be able to provide reliable reports on student records, administrative and financial reporting needs. Since implementation of this system began, there has been improvements, such as the system's capacity to produce class lists and to invoice students. However, this system still continues to have difficulty providing the information required for informed decision-making and government reporting requirements. For instance, the evaluator's request in July of 1997 for accurate student data (basic information such as enrollment, retention, student demographics) was only partially filled by December 1997. The system could not provide retention rates, or FTE counts, and had problems in producing student demographic information and accurate enrollment counts for this evaluation.

With respect to financial records, the IIG appears to have a system that provides the information needed to enable management to make appropriate decisions. The IIG is improving its student record system, but does not yet have the full capability to produce reliable and appropriate information regarding student records. It also is not able to produce all the information needed for the KPI reporting process of the Ministry. The IIG is aware of these shortcomings and is making efforts to address them. In addition, the IIG

does not have a process in place, or any plans to implement one, for ensuring they have accurate information for tracking students once they leave the IIG, which will be required for future follow-up research.

As indicated earlier, the evaluation framework for the IIG has identified the following five components in the overall evaluation of the IIG:

- formative evaluation of key processes;
- institutional monitoring and tracking processes;
- institutional self-evaluation;
- colleges and institutes student outcomes survey; and
- summative evaluation;

Each of these five components would address different evaluation issues. The only way to ensure that all issues in the framework are addressed, is to carry out all five components. The formative evaluation reported here is a rigorous review of the effectiveness and efficiency of the IIG's management and delivery. It does not, however, fully address issues pertaining to the relevance and quality of instructional programs and curriculum and the appropriateness and effectiveness of student support, that would typically be addressed through the institutional self-evaluation process. The formative evaluation also does not address issues pertaining to outcomes achievement, acceptance, and cost effectiveness. The process of achieving credit transfer agreements provides a measure of credibility and acceptance by other institutions, but does not fully address these issues either. Institutional self-evaluation and participation in the colleges and institutes student outcome survey will be needed for a comprehensive evaluation of the IIG.

As of January 1998, the IIG did not have a formal institutional self-evaluation process in place. The IIG will need a self-evaluation process and an Education Council in order to fully meet the accountability requirements of the Ministry. The IIG has started the process of establishing an Education Council (see Chapter 4) and has established formal personnel evaluation and faculty review processes[33] as well as an informal curriculum review processes. These processes can be useful components for a formal institutional self-evaluation process, if formalized and a process is developed for systematically addressing the issues to be addressed in the self-evaluation process.

---

[33] *Personnel Evaluation: a process for motivation and human development.* Draft, June '96, Institute of Indigenous Government.

4. Management Direction

This chapter deals with findings on the effectiveness of management and governance of the IIG, including the Education Council, communication and partnerships.

4.1 Management of the IIG

*Issue: **Does the IIG have effective and timely management provided by its President and administrators? Are the directives of the Board carried out appropriately? Is planning co-ordinated and integrated and linked with the strategic plan? Are all stakeholders (the Board, administrators, instructors, students, support staff and external stakeholders) appropriately involved in planning?***[34]

The management structure of the IIG has changed over time. In its first year, there were four administrators responsible for managing different aspects of the IIG: an interim President, who was at the IIG until the summer of 1996; two different Bursars,[35] who each held the position for about half of the first year; the Dean of Academic Affairs, and the Director of Planning. The Dean and the Director of Planning were both involved in developing the plan for the IIG, negotiating its funding, and working on the initial start-up of the IIG in the summer of 1995.

In the second year, the Board replaced the first interim president with another interim President, a person who had been a member of the Board during the first year, as the search for a permanent president did not result in a suitable candidate. In addition, the interim bursar was replaced by the third Bursar, the Director of Planning became the Dean of Student Affairs and another member of the Board was appointed to the new position of Director of Extension.

In June of 1997, the IIG reorganized its administrative structure and eliminated the position of Dean of Student Affairs. The former Dean of Student Affairs is also an associate professor, and continues to be a member of the faculty with some administrative responsibilities. The Dean of Academic Affairs has taken over responsibility for the student development program, which had been managed by the Dean of Student Affairs until June 1997. At the time of writing, the IIG did not have a permanent president; the interim President appointed in 1996 was still in this position in 1997/98.

The executive of the IIG has consisted of the senior administrators, who have had ultimate responsibility for the management of the IIG and have made all final management decisions before they are brought to the Board for approval. Given the small size of the administration, each person has had a number of responsibilities, which in a larger organization would be carried out by different people.

---

34 Issue 4.3 is addressed in this section.

35 The second Bursar was appointed in an interim capacity when the first Bursar left.

The composition of the executive has varied over time. In the first year, it consisted of four people, the interim President, the Bursar, the Dean of Academic Affairs, and the Director of Planning. In the second year the executive was expanded to six people, the Director of Extension and the Director of the International Program, in addition to the original four, the interim President, the Bursar, the Dean of Academic Affairs, and the Dean of Student Affairs (formerly the Director of Planning). Since the restructuring in June 1997, the executive has consisted of three people: the President, the Bursar and the Dean of Academic Affairs; it was these three people who developed the restructuring plan. The Dean of Academic Affairs is the only member of the executive who has been at the IIG since its beginning in 1995.

Planning and decision making have been carried out in a number of ways. The main focus of the IIG's planning efforts have been on the development of its academic and student development programs. The Dean of Academic Affairs has been overseeing the planning for the academic program, with input obtained through meetings with the faculty, which are held periodically. The Dean has been responsible for overseeing education program planning and implementation, curriculum and library development, academic policy development, instructional and library staffing and administration. Faculty have been directly involved in developing and approving curriculum and the academic program content. The Dean of Academic Affairs has been developing academic policies, with some input from faculty. The Dean has been bringing decisions about the academic program and academic policies to the Board for approval.

The Dean has also been co-ordinating governmental and institutional relations and advising the IIG President on relations with Indigenous Nations, federal-provincial relations, and relationships with other post-secondary institutions. In addition, the Dean has been working with other post-secondary institutions to develop credit transfer agreements. During the start-up phase of the IIG, the Dean supervised information services, and during the first two years, the student registration office.

In the first year, the Director of Planning, in addition to teaching, was involved in education program planning, curriculum development and was responsible for the initial development of the extension and international programs, co-ordination of the video production, and development of the staff and faculty evaluation process. The Director of Planning was also responsible for the development of the student development program, in consultation with the staff involved in the program, including elders and counsellors. In the second year, the Director of Planning became the Dean of Student Affairs, and a Director of Extension and a Director of the International program were hired. With this change, the student development program was expanded to be the main focus of responsibility for the Dean of Student Affairs. Decisions about the student development program were brought to the President to present them to the Board for approval. With the elimination of the position of Dean of Student Affairs in June 1997, the Dean of Academic Affairs became responsible for the student development program.

The Bursar, according to the *College and Institute Act*, is responsible for advising the Board on all financial matters of the Institute. The Bursar has been overseeing the administration of the IIG, including financial planning and monitoring, human resources management and, as of June 1997, student registration. Until June 1997, student registration was overseen by the Dean of Academic Affairs.

All senior administrators report to the President, who, according to the *College and Institute Act*, is the Chief Executive Officer of the Institute and advises the IIG Board of Governors on matters concerning the operation of the Institute. The President is responsible for ensuring that administrators, instructors and other staff perform their duties as assigned by the Board, and for ensuring that the directives of the Board are carried out. The President has also been acting as a liaison between the IIG and other educational institutions, by sitting on the committee for Chief Executive Officers of the Advanced Education Council of British Columbia. The President and the Dean of Academic Affairs have been working together in providing liaison with the Ministry on academic program and funding issues.

Much of the initial hiring was done by the Dean of Academic Affairs and the Director of Planning. The Dean of Academic Affairs has continued playing a key role in hiring decisions, as well as in decisions to reassign personnel to different positions. The Dean has also evaluated instructional staff to determine whether or not to renew their contracts.[36] At the time of writing, the evaluation of three of the instructional staff had included a peer review process.

There has been a high turn over of employees since the IIG's beginning. As of January 1998, people in the following positions have either been dismissed, not had their contracts renewed, or quit: the registrar in the first year, two bursars in the first year, the first interim president, the assistant director of planning, an information officer, an executive assistant, a full-time member of the faculty, two extension co-ordinators (Vancouver Island and Lillooet), the secretary at the Saanich extension site (part time), a counsellor (part time), the executive assistant for the Dean of Student Affairs, the human resources manager, the registrar's assistant, and an elder. In some cases, the vacant position has been filled by a new employee, or by moving an existing employee into the vacant position. In other cases the position had been eliminated because of restructuring, such as the elimination of the Dean of Student Affairs. Only three of these positions (the executive assistant for the Dean of Student Affairs, the human resources manager, the registrar's assistant) were eliminated as part of the down-sizing that occurred in June 1997.

Respondents' Views

Respondents, including administrators, instructors and non-instructional staff were asked whether the senior administration of the IIG provides effective management. They were also asked whether planning processes at the IIG are inclusive enough and whether they

[36] All faculty, except for the Dean of Academic Affairs and the former Dean of Student Affairs, who both have tenure, are hired on contracts that vary from one term to two years.

were satisfied with communication between the IIG's administration and employees. As there was a high degree of overlap in responses to these three questions, respondents' views on all three questions have been combined and summarized into themes and presented here.

In total, the three senior administrators and 17 employees[37] of the IIG who are not part of the senior administration were interviewed. Of the 17 employees, two respondents said they did not know whether the senior administration provides effective management. Of the remaining 15, five expressed generally positive views on the effectiveness of management, while ten respondents thought that the senior administration was not providing effective management of the IIG. The views of these two groups, on management effectiveness, the inclusiveness of planning processes and communication between management and employees, are summarized below.

Of the five employees who were satisfied with management's effectiveness, one expressed concern with weaknesses, such as lack of planning and lack of administrative experience, but thought that management effectiveness was continually improving. Another respondent commented on the growing pains of setting up an institution without a model to draw upon, but thought that management was handling the challenge well.

With respect to planning being inclusive enough, one of the five respondents did not know. Of the remaining four, two were satisfied, and two thought consultation was inconsistent. Three of the five employees who were satisfied with management effectiveness, were also satisfied with communication between management and employees, one thought communication could be improved, and another thought that management was making efforts to improve communication.

Of the ten employees who were not satisfied with management's effectiveness, the majority had a number of concerns pertaining to management, consultation and communication. These responses have been grouped into themes. The most frequently mentioned themes are described below (the number of respondents who made at least one response that fits into the theme is provided).

- Consultation processes to provide input into planning and decision making: Nine respondents were concerned that decisions were made without consultation with employees, or consultation was inconsistent, or employees' input was not considered by management.

- Communication between management and employees: A total of nine respondents had one or more of the following concerns: reasons for decisions were not communicated, decisions were not put in writing, and/or communication was only top-down.

---

37 The term *"employees"* is used in this section to refer to the IIG instructors, junior administrators and other staff who were interviewed. This term is used to distinguish them from the senior administrators of the IIG, which comprise the IIG's executive, and are referred to as management.

- Leadership and planning: Eight respondents identified one or more of the following concerns pertaining to leadership or planning: management did not provide leadership or clear direction; management was reactive, rather than proactive; planning was inadequate and priorities had not been identified.

- The experience and expertise of management: Seven respondents expressed some concern regarding the lack of experience or expertise of management, particularly pertaining to planning, financial management or personnel management.

- Decision making at the management level: Six respondents expressed one or more of the following concerns with how management made decisions: management made decisions that were arbitrary and consequences of decisions were not considered; inappropriate decisions were made; some decisions were influenced by UBCIC politics; senior administrators were not accountable for their decisions and actions.

- Working conditions and personnel issues: Six respondents reported one or more of the following concerns about working conditions and personnel issues: employees were not provided with support/information to do their jobs; clear policies and procedures were lacking; roles and responsibilities of employees and/or administrators were not clearly defined; time release was not provided to faculty when doing non-teaching tasks; job descriptions were not provided or were not clear; there was no collective agreement or formal process to deal with employees' concerns, or union to protect employees.

- High turn over at the IIG and employees being fired: Five of the ten respondents were concerned with the number of people who had either left the IIG or been fired. Their specific issues ranged from concerns that some essential people had been fired to concerns that some people left or were fired because they disagreed with management. The way people were terminated in June 1997, particularly terminating people with no notice and asking them to leave the building immediately, was seen by respondents as showing a lack of caring and respect. According to respondents, people were afraid of losing their job for expressing their views and the firings and fear of being fired were having a negative impact on morale.

Employees were also asked for suggestions for how management can be improved in the future. These are listed in Appendix C.

The three senior administrators were also asked for their views on management effectiveness. Specifically, they were asked if they were satisfied that they were able to carry out the directives of the Board and whether there are barriers that limit their effectiveness in managing the IIG. They were also asked whether planning processes were inclusive enough and whether they were satisfied with communication between them and employees of the IIG.

While one senior administrator thought that management was satisfactory, the other two thought that management needed improving. All acknowledged that there were barriers

that limited the effectiveness of the management. The most common barriers to effective management that senior administrators identified have been summarized into four themes:

- Need for Board development: All three senior administrators expressed this concern. Specific concerns pertaining to Board development were: need to distinguish between governance and operational issues; need to clarify roles and responsibilities.

- Limited time for planning and development of the IIG: Two of the three senior administrators acknowledged the lack of time for planning either at the initial start up, or ongoing because staff were too busy to spend time planning.

- Concerns with the *Colleges and Institutes Act*: Two respondents were concerned either with poor legislative drafting of the *Act*, requiring more people on the Education Council than employed at the IIG; or thought their was a need to balance what the *Act* requires with requirements of Indigenous law and principles.

- Financial constraints: Two respondents identified financial constraints as a barrier to effective management. Specific examples they offered include: no budget for professional development; no funding for the information management system used by other colleges; human resources used to the maximum.

Other barriers to management effectiveness were identified by individual respondents. One respondent observed that effectiveness has been hampered by major communication problems caused by employees with personal agendas undermining the authority of administration. Another thought that inadequate information systems at the beginning had been a barrier to effectiveness, although this had improved significantly.

Two of the three senior administrators thought that planning processes were sometimes inclusive, but there was a need to be consistent in this area. The other administrator thought that planning had been as inclusive as was appropriate, in that some issues need to be left to the senior administration.

One senior administrator thought that communication between administration and employees was reasonably effective, while at the same time acknowledging some problems in this area which the respondent attributed, as previously reported, to the personal agendas of specific employees. The other two believed that communication could be improved. One thought that the budget reductions in June 1997 had hurt communication because of the effect the layoffs had had on employees. The other acknowledged the challenges in establishing effective communication processes and admitted that other priorities had come in the way of addressing communication issues. The suggestions for improvement of management and communication offered by the senior administrators are provided in Appendix C.

Board members were also asked questions pertaining to management effectiveness, the inclusiveness of planning processes and communication between management and employees. Four of the six Board respondents thought that management was effective.

One thought that management was not effective and another was aware of some management issues that indicated that management was not entirely effective.

Three of the six Board members thought that planning processes at the IIG were inclusive enough. Of the remaining three, one respondent believed that planning should be done by the Board, without input. Another respondent thought that planning was not inclusive since the senior administration made all the decisions, while another believed that planning could be improved by involving more people.

With regard to communication between management and employees, one of the six Board members did not have an opinion and three of the remaining five were satisfied. Two Board members were aware of communication problems; one of these thought the communication problems began with the lay-offs in June 1997.

Even some of the Board members who were generally satisfied with management effectiveness also expressed some concerns about the effectiveness of management.

These concerns are summarized below:

- Abilities of management: Concerns about the abilities of management were expressed by three respondents, such as: lack of experience; limited expertise; weak leadership; and/or communication problems.

- Need for policies: Two respondents expressed a need for policies, specifically: there was a need for policies that could be consistently applied; policies were needed to deal with personnel issues.

- The hierarchical structure of the Institute: This concern was raised by two respondents, specifically: the hierarchical structure was at odds with the consensual way of Indigenous decision making; the hierarchical structure was a barrier to resolving problems.

- Interference with the operation of the Board: Two respondents thought the senior administration had interfered with the operation of the Board, specifically: the Board was not able to give good direction because administration made all the decisions; administration tried to control Board meetings.

Board members were also aware of barriers that have affected management's ability to be effective. Two respondents had concerns that there was limited time for planning, which had resulted in confusion and the need to make quick decisions. Limited financial resources was identified as a barrier by two respondents. The suggestions of Board members on improving management are provided in Appendix C.

The majority of external stakeholders who were asked (8 out of 13) did not feel they had enough contact with the IIG to determine whether management was effective. Three others were satisfied that management was effective, but acknowledged that they

had knowledge only about specific aspects of the IIG's management. Another respondent was satisfied (with some reservations) and one respondent was not satisfied that management was effective. All the concerns about the IIG's management offered by external stakeholders are summarized here:

- the administration needs to do more to promote the IIG (2 respondents);
- financial problems of the IIG suggest poor financial management (1 respondent);
- concerns with the credibility of the administration due to little Aboriginal representation and having only an interim President (1 respondent); and
- high employee turn over suggests problems with control and clarity of roles (1 respondent).

Five external stakeholders were asked whether the planning processes at the IIG were inclusive enough. Three of these did not know. One of the remaining two thought that planning was inclusive, but acknowledged limited knowledge to judge this. The other respondent had some concerns that the Board and Ministry personnel were not adequately involved in planning.

Conclusions

Employees of the IIG believe very strongly in the Mission of the IIG and want to see it succeed. They support the Institute itself, but, as the findings indicate, the majority believe that management has not been effective. IIG employees reported a number of concerns about management, including flawed decision making and financial management, insufficient planning and consultation and inadequate communication. There have been extenuating circumstances that need to be considered when judging the effectiveness of IIG's management, though. For instance, the limited time the IIG had at the beginning to plan its development; the lack of a model to guide its development, hence the need for trial and error; and inadequate financial resources to fully implement its plan.

The timing of the interviews for this evaluation may be one reason why the evaluation found that a majority of employees had so many concerns with the IIG's management. The layoffs occurred in late June 1997, and the interviews began in the middle of August, 1997. The IIG's employees were concerned for the future of the IIG, as well as for their own jobs. Some blamed management for the IIG's financial difficulties and thought that employees, and ultimately the IIG, were paying the price for these problems. They were concerned that the management was not accountable for the consequences of their decisions. To the employees of the IIG, accountability means management accepting responsibility for their mistakes, and perhaps even paying directly for these mistakes, rather than employees losing their jobs through no fault of their own.

The June down-sizing was only one of many issues raised by employees during the interview process, though. The need for down-sizing appears to have undermined employees' confidence in the ability of senior administrators to manage the IIG

effectively. In addition, the manner in which the down-sizing was carried out has eroded employees' confidence that management will treat IIG employees in a fair and respectful manner. A number of employees believed that people had been let go (or their contracts not renewed) because of disagreements with the senior administration, and that financial problems have been used as an excuse for terminating people with whom management disagreed. Employees have felt excluded from involvement in important decisions and are wanting to be more involved in making the IIG a success. From their perspective, management has been making mistakes, but has been reluctant to let employees help them overcome the challenges facing the IIG.

The fact that so many employees made negative comments about management reflects on the effectiveness of management itself. Even if, as one senior administrator had suggested, some of the problems were the result of personal agendas of some employees, an effective management should have been able to deal appropriately with individuals whose personal agendas were interfering with the operation of the IIG.

The IIG's management has not been effective in encouraging the confidence and support of the employees of the Institute and in dealing with their concerns. Management has not been effectively involving employees in planning and decision making and, as a consequence, has not been making the best use of its human resources. Communication between management and employees has not been effective; this is a fundamental weakness and underlies the other management problems. The poor relations that have developed between the management and the majority of the IIG's employees, and the low morale among employees, are serious problems that will, if not corrected, affect the operation of the IIG.

4.2 Education Council

Issue: In the absence of an Education Council, does the Board receive effective and timely advice on education issues? If so, how?[38]

The issue that was originally intended to be addressed in this evaluation, was whether the education council was effective in providing advice to the Board on education issues. When the evaluation was conducted the IIG did not have an education council, so the evaluation issue was modified to find out how advice on education issues was provided to the Board in the absence of an education council, and whether this alternative was effective.

Since an education council is a requirement for all colleges and institutes under the *College and Institute Amendment Act* (1994), the treatment of this issue begins with a description of the purpose and role of an education council, as set out in the *Act*, why the IIG did not have an education council and what the IIG did as an alternative. Respondents' views on the effectiveness of this alternative are then presented.

---

[38] Issue 4.2 of the Research Plan is addressed here.

The College and Institute Amendment Act (1994) specifies that *"Each institution, other than the Justice Institute of British Columbia, must have an education council."* The *Act* specifies the composition of the education council in some detail. In particular, the council must have 20 voting members, including 10 faculty members, four educational administrators, two support staff and four students. The registrar is responsible for conducting elections for student, faculty and support staff representatives to the education council.

According to the *Act*, the education council has the power and duty to:

- set policies concerning examinations and evaluation of student performances;
- set policies concerning student withdrawal from courses, programs and the institution;
- set criteria for academic standing, academic standards and the grading system;
- set criteria for awards recognizing academic excellence;
- set policy and procedures for appeals by students on academic matters and establish a final appeal tribunal for these appeals; and
- set curriculum content for courses leading to certificates, diplomas or degrees.

The education council also has an advisory role to the Board on a broad range of issues pertaining to educational policy and the evaluation of programs and education services.

When the IIG began, it did not have enough employees to establish an education council as specified in the *Act*. On instruction from the Board, the Dean of Academic Affairs did research on how to interpret the *Act* with respect to the education council. It was the Dean's recommendation (in a memorandum to the Board of Governors, dated February 15, 1996) that, rather than establish an education council, the Dean's *ad hoc* Academic Affairs Committee be expanded and designated to function as an education council. The *ad hoc* Academic Affairs Committee, consisting of faculty, resident elders, the head librarian, and the registrar, could be expanded to include two students, one support staff, the President (non-voting) and a member appointed by the Board (non-voting) to make a total membership of 15.

At the same time, the Dean of Academic Affairs was also asked by the Board to draft terms of reference for the Board's Academic Program Committee, which was established by the Board in December 1995, and consisted of three members of the Board. The Dean provided terms of reference in another memorandum to the Board of Governors, also dated February 15, 1996. The terms of reference would have given the Board's Academic Program Committee an advisory role to the Board on all matters that would be covered under both the powers and advisory role of the education council, until such time as an education council was established.

The Board reviewed both proposals at the meeting of the Board on February 15, 1996 and passed a motion to have the Academic Program Committee of the Board examine the Dean's recommendations. At the next meeting of the Board, on March 21, 1996, the Board moved that the Academic Program Committee perform the functions of a hiring committee, and be expanded to include an Elder, the Dean and the Director of Planning. At the Board meeting on April 18, 1996, the Academic Program Committee reported back to the Board on the Dean's recommendations made at the February meeting, asking the Dean to provide further clarification on the issue for a formal resolution at the next board meeting. The issue was not discussed at the next meeting, and was never brought up again at meetings of the Board. Hence, no decision was made by the Board on either recommendation.

At the time of writing, the Academic Program Committee had no terms of reference, except to function as a hiring committee, and has not met since 1996. The Dean's *ad hoc* Academic Affairs Committee had not been expanded to function as an education council.

As is apparent from the minutes of the meetings of the Board, in absence of an education council, the Board receives advice on education issues primarily from the Dean of Academic Affairs. The Director of Extension provides some advice and information on extension issues. The President and other administrators provide advice and information relevant to education issues from time to time.

The IIG faculty started to lobby for the establishment of the education council in the summer of 1997. In the Fall 1997, the Dean and faculty struck a committee to develop a proposal for composition of the education council. The proposed structure includes two elders, to reflect the culture of the IIG. The faculty, at a meeting with the Dean and the President, approved the proposed structure on October 31. The proposal was expected to go to the Board for their approval at the November 1997 meeting, but the education council was not on the agenda.[39] At the time of writing, no action on establishing an education council had been taken, as the registrar had not received instruction from the Board about conducting the elections for representatives to the council.

Respondents' Views

Administration, non-instructional staff, instructors, members of the Board and some government stakeholders were asked how advice on education issues is provided to the Board in the absence of an education council, and whether this alternative was effective.

According to Board members, the Board receives advice on education issues largely from the Dean. Respondents also indicated that the President also provides advice, as does the Director of Extension and faculty have input through the faculty representative on the Board.

[39] The education council was also not on the agenda at the December 1997 or January 1998 meetings of the Board.

Two of the six Board members who were interviewed did not indicate whether or not they thought the process of obtaining advice was effective. Of the remaining four, one Board member thought the process was effective, and three thought that the process was not as effective as it could be. One of these three thought the process was not effective because the Board didn't always have all the information when they were making decisions. Another Board member observed that the Board only received the information right at meetings; there was always pressure to make decisions at the meeting when the information was presented. The other Board member thought that having one person provide advice was not as good as having the perspective of a committee. Most members of the Board did not have specific suggestions on how to improve this process, although three suggested that establishing an education council would be an improvement.

Administrators agreed that the Dean was the primary source of advice to the Board. Three of the six administrators did not indicate whether or not they thought this process was effective. Of the remaining three, one thought it was effective and two thought it was not effective, because faculty were not consulted and the process limited information and options for the Board. Three of the six administrators thought that an education council would be an improvement because it would allow faculty and non-instructional staff to have input. One other administrator suggested a more effective committee structure and another suggested terms of reference for the Board were needed.

The instructors' understanding of how the Board operates varied considerably. Five of the eight instructors who were interviewed did not know how the Board obtained advice on education issues. The other three all believed that the Dean was the primary source of advice to the Board and all three thought that this had not been an effective process because the Board had not dealt with education issues and broader input to the Board on these issues was needed. Two elders were also asked how advice is provided; they indicated that reports from the Dean and other senior administrators were the primary method of providing advice to the Board. They did not indicate whether or not they thought this process was effective.

When asked for suggestions on how to improve the process of providing advice on education issues to the Board, two instructors did not have suggestions for improving the process. Five of the remaining six instructors suggested the need for an education council to broaden the input into decision making and ensure that all issues get addressed. Three also offered general suggestions, such as providing more structure to get feedback on issues, bringing educators on the Board, and ensuring that non-instructional staff and faculty have direct input to the Board.

The proposal for the composition of the education council was developed after most of the interviews were completed. As a consequence, follow-up interviews were conducted with a number of instructors, non-instructional staff and administrators on this, as well as other, issues. All seven who were asked about the proposal expressed positive views about the proposed structure. After the proposal had been approved by faculty, it was supposed to go to the Board for their approval at the November meeting of the Board, but it was not on the agenda for that meeting. Three employees were interviewed after the November

Board meeting. All three expressed concerns that the process had been stalled since the faculty's proposed structure did not go to the Board for their approval when planned.

Conclusions

In summary, of the twenty respondents who were asked whether the process used to provide advice to the Board on education issues is effective, half of the respondents did not offer a clear opinion. Of the ten who did, eight did not believe the process was effective, or thought it was not as effective as it could be. The primary concern raised by respondents was that the process being used at the time of interviews did not allow for effective input from faculty and non-instructional staff and thereby limited the perspectives presented to the Board.

The education council, as required under the *Act*, is a way of providing the Board with input on education issues from a broad range of perspectives. The IIG does not have an education council and findings suggest that it does not have an effective process for providing this input and hence does not have an effective alternative for an education council. The comments made by non-instructional staff and instructors in response to this issue suggest that the delays in implementing the proposal for the IIG's education council have reinforced some employees' perceptions (as reported in the previous section) that senior administrators are trying to block the formation of a council because they are unwilling to consult with employees.

4.3 Communication

Issue: Does the administration of IIG provide effective communication to staff, students and stakeholders? Is there a process for communication that can remain effective as the IIG grows?[40]

All respondents were asked whether they are satisfied with communication between the IIG and the members of their cohort for the following:

- management and employees;
- management and Board members;
- the IIG Board and the UBCIC;
- management and students; and
- management and external stakeholders.

Administrators were asked about all five. Information on the context pertaining to communication, as well as respondents' views, are presented separately for each combination. Suggestions for improving communication offered by respondents are provided in Appendix C.

[40] Issue 4.4 of the Research Plan is addressed in this section.

Communication between management and employees

The IIG does not have a policies or procedures handbook. Policies are developed from time to time, but there is not a consistent method of communicating policies to employees. Academic policies are published in the calendar; policy changes are communicated to faculty through memos. Other policies are communicated to employees verbally or through memos. A final draft of the student handbook was completed in June 1997 by the Dean of Student Affairs; the Dean of Academic Affairs took over responsibility for this area at that time and the handbook had not been released at the time of writing.

Meetings with employees have been held infrequently; the last two meetings of all employees were in June 1997 (to announce the down-sizing decision) and December 1997 (to discuss the need to reduce expenses in the 1997/98 budget). Faculty meetings have been held more frequently than have staff meetings, although frequency has varied. There were four faculty meetings from January to June 1997 and six faculty meetings in the Fall of 1997.[41]

Findings on communication between IIG management and employees have already been presented earlier in this chapter, under *Management of the IIG*. In the comments made by respondents, there was a strong relationship between employees' views about management effectiveness and their satisfaction with communication. Of the five employees who thought that management was effective, four had positive views about communication between management and employees. Of the ten employees who thought that management was not effective, nine were also unsatisfied with communication between management and employees. There were three types of concerns with communication expressed by employees:

- Communication should be two-way, but at the IIG it was only top down; senior administration made decisions and communicated them to employees, without seeking input first.

- Decisions were not always communicated in writing, and reasons for decisions were not always provided.

- Employees were not always kept informed, even about issues directly affecting them, or information necessary for them to do their job.

All senior administrators were aware that communication between them and employees was less than satisfactory. The communication situation at the IIG was aptly captured in the words of one senior administrator, *"Day to day workloads impact on one's ability to find the time to develop proper communication channels and set aside the amount of time needed to use them effectively."* Two Board members were also aware of communication problems, although the other four were satisfied with communication between administration and employees.

---

41 Five faculty meetings were held in 1996; no faculty meetings were held in January or February of 1998.

Communication between IIG administration and Board members

The primary communication from the IIG administration to Board members are reports presented to the Board, either in writing or verbally, at Board meetings. Discussion at Board meetings, and decisions reported in minutes of Board meetings is the primary communication from Board members.

Four out of seven Board members were satisfied with communication between them and the IIG administration. One of the three dissatisfied with communication indicated that the senior administration had not keep the Board adequately informed of problems at the IIG. Senior administrators, on the other hand, thought that communication between the Board and the administration was not always clear.

Communication between IIG Board and the UBCIC

The President of the UBCIC is the Chair of the IIG Board. The President of the IIG makes a presentation to the Chief's Council of the UBCIC at their annual assembly.

IIG administrators and Board members were satisfied with communication between the Board and the UBCIC. The only members of the UBCIC who were interviewed were either current or former members of the IIG Board, hence we do not have the perspective of members of the UBCIC who are not actively involved in the IIG.

Communication between IIG administration and students

In its second year, the IIG implemented some communication mechanisms for Vancouver students by providing all Vancouver students with a mailbox and an email account. In the Fall of 1997, the students and faculty began a newsletter. Extension students do not have email accounts, or any formal communication mechanisms with the IIG. The main source of information for students on academic policies is the IIG calendar.

Instructors and junior administrators were generally satisfied with communication between students and employees. One of the 15 interviewed reported an example of poor communication and unclear policy around criteria for awarding certificates, which resulted in students not receiving certificates at convocation ceremonies when they had expected to receive them. Another felt that communication between administration and students could be improved. Three had concerns about communication between senior administrators and students, and all three commented that senior administrators were paternalistic towards students and had interfered with the student association. The three senior administrators were satisfied with communication with students. One of the six Board members did not have an opinion on communication between administrators and students. Four of the remaining five were satisfied and one Board member felt that administration was not listening to students' concerns.

Students were asked to rate their level of satisfaction, and those in the focus groups were also asked to provide their reasons for their views on communication. The satisfaction ratings are provided in Table 4-1. Students on the Vancouver campus were satisfied with

communication (with an average rating of 5.2, where 4 is neither satisfied or unsatisfied and 7 is extremely satisfied). Students at the two extension campuses were dissatisfied with communication (with average ratings of 3.1 and 2.1, for Lillooet and Saanich students, respectively, where 1 is extremely unsatisfied).

TABLE 4-1
Student's Average Satisfaction Ratings with Communication

Campus	Average Rating *
Vancouver Campus	
Focus Groups (n = 21)	5.4
Non-focus Groups (n =14)	5.1
Overall (n = 35)	5.2
Saanich Campus	
Focus Groups (n = 5)	2.0
Non-focus Groups (n = 6)	2.2
Overall (n = 11)	2.1
Lillooet Campus	
Focus Groups (n = 2) **	2.0
Non-focus Groups (n = 6)	4.2
Overall (n = 8)	3.1

* A seven-point rating scale, with 1 = extremely unsatisfied, and 7 = extremely satisfied.
** With only two respondents, this average should be interpreted with caution.

Comments made in the focus groups indicated that lack of access to people from IIG was one of the reasons for their dissatisfaction. There was no one at either extension campus who could provide students with information or answer their questions. Both Lillooet and Saanich students in focus groups reported having had difficulties in contacting instructors outside of class time and delays in receiving grades. Students at the Saanich site who participated in the focus group commented that they have had difficulty even getting access to a telephone to make a long distance call to the IIG, and reported that there have been problems with student records getting lost. They also reported that the IIG administration failed to respond to the letters they had written about their concerns.

Of the five students who were interviewed (four who had left the IIG early and one who had audited one course), two were satisfied and three were not satisfied with communication between students and administration.

Communication between IIG administration and external stakeholders

Communication between IIG administration and external stakeholders, such as the provincial and federal government, and post-secondary and Aboriginal organizations, has

depended on the nature of the relationship. For example, communication with post-secondary institutions involved in negotiating credit transfer agreements was specific to the information needed for the negotiating process. Many of the external stakeholders have had only limited communication between them and the IIG.

One out of the seven Board members did not have an opinion about communication with external stakeholders. Three of the remaining six were satisfied and three thought that more work needed to be done in this area. Two out of six administrators were satisfied with communication and the remaining four felt that more work was needed in this area, although they also observed that lack of time and money was a limitation.

Representatives from five different communities were contacted for this evaluation; four in focus groups, and one member of the UBCIC. One community had not heard of the IIG and the other four were not satisfied with communication. All thought that communication was insufficient. The two communities involved in the extension program were also concerned about the lack of a local education co-ordinator to facilitate communication between their community and the IIG.

The majority of stakeholders (62%) were unsatisfied with communication with the IIG (almost all Aboriginal and post-secondary organizations and half of government stakeholders were not satisfied), although almost half of those unsatisfied acknowledged that they were as much at fault for the poor communication as was the IIG.

Conclusions

Overall, the findings indicate that the IIG does not have effective communication processes. There are no consistent communication processes in place, so sometimes employees and students are informed and sometimes they are not. Communication with extension students is a particular challenge for the IIG and one that findings suggest is not being effectively met. Communication with external stakeholders is an area where more effort is needed, both on the part of the IIG, as well as the external stakeholders themselves.

Inadequate communication has contributed to distrust and disrespect between senior administration and employees, as employees have come to rely on rumours for their information. For example, some respondents reported that they believed some information was deliberately kept from them to ensure that they could not do their job. Sometimes the communication itself has been a source of the problem, as it has reinforced the employees' views that they are not being consulted, only being told the decisions that were made without their input.

Although they were aware of some of the communication problems, senior administrators were more positive about communication than were employees. The difference in how management and employees have perceived communication effectiveness points out part of the challenge in providing effective communication.

With all the competing demands on the attention and time of the IIG administrators, communication has not received adequate attention. Unfortunately, the lack of attention to communication has resulted in communication problems that have contributed to the management problems and low morale among employees.

4.4 Partnerships

Issue: ***Has the IIG developed effective relationships with Aboriginal people in British Columbia? How, and to what extent, has the IIG succeeded in developing effective partnerships among various levels of government, First Nations, employers, distance education agencies (e.g. OLA) and community groups?***[42]

The IIG began with a formal partnership agreement with the Open Learning Institute with respect to granting joint credentials. This agreement has expired and there are no plans for a new partnership with the Open Learning Institute. The IIG has also had an informal partnership with the University of Northern BC to develop credit transfer arrangements for all their programs in the associate of arts degree.

The funding agreements with the federal and provincial governments could be considered a form of partnership, although one in which government plays a passive role. The IIG has had no partnerships with potential employers, aboriginal communities or post-secondary organizations, except for the credit transfer agreements described above, although there have been working relationships with the Lillooet and Saanich communities for the extension program and with the Urban Native Education Centre in Vancouver to use facilities for the science course.

Respondents' Views

The IIG administrators, and Members of the Board, were asked whether they are satisfied that the IIG was developing effective partnerships with:

- First Nation communities and organizations;
- other post-secondary organizations;
- provincial and federal governments; and
- potential employers.

Some external stakeholders were asked whether they were satisfied with the relationship their organization had with the IIG. Some government stakeholders were also asked if they were satisfied with the relationship the IIG had with other post-secondary organizations, First Nations communities, potential employers and the federal and provincial government.

The views of respondents pertaining to partnerships with these four stakeholders groups are reported separately for each stakeholder group.

---

[42] Issues 2.3 and 3.3 of the Research Plan are addressed in this section.

- Partnerships with First Nation communities and organizations: The majority of the Board (five out of seven) were satisfied that the IIG was developing effective partnerships with First Nation communities and organizations. Two members pointed out the need to work at solidifying relationships with communities.

  All administrators were satisfied with their partnership with the UBCIC, but five out of six were uncertain about partnerships with other First Nation organizations and communities and acknowledged that more work needed to be done in this area. Face-to-face communication was seen as necessary to develop these partnerships, but the costs of travel, and the time to do this, were constraints. One administrator noted that the economic problems of First Nations communities has presented barriers to establishing partnerships with them, as the IIG can be viewed as a source of revenue for the community, rather than as a partner working with the community toward a common goal.

  There was a perception expressed by one member of the Board and two IIG administrators that other Aboriginal post-secondary organizations were jealous of the IIG's independent, degree-granting status. It is worth noting that there was no evidence of jealousy in the comments made by the four representatives of Aboriginal post-secondary organizations who were interviewed; in fact all made comments supportive of the IIG. As one respondent from an Aboriginal post-secondary organization put it, *"it would be unhealthy for us as Aboriginal people to want to see the demise of the IIG."* This same respondent observed that, as Aboriginal organizations, *"we have to prove ourselves over and over again, so we are reluctant to accept help, ...would like to find a way to use each other's expertise and be stronger working together."*

  Two respondents from Aboriginal post-secondary organizations were satisfied with their relationship with the IIG, and two were not. The primary reason for dissatisfaction for these two respondents was lack of communication between their organization and the IIG. They acknowledged that time constraints was the main reason for poor communication.

  Two of the three government stakeholders who were asked, were not satisfied that the IIG had effective relationships with First Nations communities and organizations. These two government stakeholders, as well as one administrator, identified the IIG's relationship with the Union as limiting the IIG's potential to form relationships. One respondent thought that the association with the Union may cause people to perceive the IIG as a political organization even though it is not. Another thought that the IIG's First Nation focus was limited to the Union. The other respondent was concerned that the IIG administration had made some decisions with respect to extension sites based on the political position of the Union.

- Partnerships with other post-secondary organizations: The only partnerships that existed in this area were the ones mentioned earlier pertaining to credit transfer. Board members had little knowledge of these partnerships; two out of seven did not know and four of the remaining five presumed that they were effective since credit transfer

agreements had been developed. One mentioned that developing these transfer agreements with other institutions should be a priority.

Two administrators and two of the three external stakeholders involved in negotiating the credit transfer agreements acknowledged that the process had had some difficulties. In addition to communication problems, there were challenges in getting the academic qualifications of some instructors accepted and in matching IIG courses with courses at other institutions, since the IIG offers courses that are not offered elsewhere. For courses that are not matched, students will only receive unassigned credit for the IIG courses if they transfer to the other institution. One respondent also had concerns that the IIG had not followed a careful and rigorous process in presenting its curriculum for credit transfer and some of their courses had not met acceptable academic standards.

All administrators were generally satisfied with existing partnerships with post-secondary organizations, but recognized that more needed to be done in forming new partnerships with other organizations. The majority of representatives from post-secondary organizations (four out of seven), both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal organizations, were not satisfied with their relationship with the IIG. The reasons pertain to lack of communication, as described in the previous section.

- Partnerships with provincial and federal governments: Four out of seven members of the Board did not know if the relationship with the federal government was effective, and two of the remaining three were not satisfied. One was concerned about the uncertainty regarding future funding from the federal government. Two members of the Board did not have an opinion about their relationship with the provincial government and three of the remaining five were not satisfied. One of the other two thought these relationships were effective and the other thought these relationships were being developed.

  Administrators expressed views similar to those of the Board. Regarding their relationship with the federal government, two out of six did not know, two of the remaining four were satisfied with their relationship with HRDC, but not DIA, one was not satisfied with the relationship with DIA and one was not satisfied at all. Regarding their relationship with the provincial government, two out of six did not know, two of the remaining four were satisfied, one thought the relationship was being improved, and one felt it was too soon to tell.

  Two out of five government stakeholders were satisfied with their relationship with the IIG, two felt that it needed development, and one thought that the relationship was what they had expected it would be that at that stage in its development. One government stakeholder mentioned that clearer roles and responsibilities were needed for a partnership.

- Partnerships with potential employers: Six out of thirteen administrators and members of the Board were not able to answer the question about partnerships with potential employers. Two out of the remaining seven were not satisfied and three believed that

these relationships were coming slowly and that Aboriginal organizations and communities (which can be regarded as potential employers) needed to learn to value their own people. Two thought it was too early to tell as there was no four-year program.

Conclusions

The IIG's partnership with OLA, and its informal partnership with the UNBC, have resulted in credit transfer arrangements, which are important for the IIG's credibility; however, the partnership with the OLA has now expired. IIG's relationships with federal government departments and provincial government ministries are weak and could be improved to ensure that government has a good understanding of the IIG's mandate and needs. More effort is needed in developing partnerships with other post-secondary institutions and Aboriginal organizations.

Ineffective communications with some Aboriginal communities, and low levels of awareness of the Institute among communities, as evidenced by the findings reported elsewhere in this report, may be inhibiting the IIG's ability to form partnerships. Communities where extension programs are delivered see themselves as recipients of a service from the IIG, rather than as partners with the IIG. These communities pay the IIG for the students' tuition, and expect the IIG to pay for the classroom space and other resources it uses. This client-supplier relationship is not conducive to forming partnerships.

In their desire to prove themselves as a credible institute apart from government intervention, and to maintain the IIG's independent degree-granting status, the IIG may be limiting its potential resources by not seeking partnerships. The lack of formal and effective partnerships in the future will likely limit the IIG's potential success. Given the IIG's limited financial resources and the cost of delivering services to Aboriginal communities, partnering with these communities, and with other institutions and agencies is essential for the IIG's ultimate success.

4.5 Governance of the IIG

Issue: Is the Governance of the IIG effective and appropriate to the Mission and objectives of the IIG?[43]

The IIG is governed by a Board consisting of 15 Aboriginal people, the majority representing Aboriginal communities that are affiliated with the Union of BC Indian Chiefs, and at least one with no community or political affiliation. Of the 15 members, 2 are student representatives, one represents the faculty and one represents the other IIG non-instructional staff. The student, non-instructional staff and faculty representatives are elected each year. Other members are nominated by the Union of BC Indian Chiefs and appointed for one or two year terms. The Chair of the Board is also the President of the Union of BC Indian Chiefs.

---

[43] Issue 4.1 of the Research Plan is addressed in this section.

The first meeting of the Board was held on December 13, 1995. The Board generally meets every month. The IIG executive, consisting of the President, the Dean of Academics and the Bursar, attend most meetings. Each of these Administrators usually makes a report to the Board at each meeting. Other administrators, particularly the Director of Extension, submits regular reports to the Board. Board members are usually supplied with reports and other information at the beginning of each meeting.

At the time of writing, there were four official committees of the Board: the academic programs committee, the finance committee, operations and staff committee and the elders committee. According to the minutes of the Board, as of the end of 1997, these committees have not met on a regular basis; the finance committee went without members for many months and the academic programs committee had not met for over a year. The operations and staff committee had developed draft terms of reference by February 1997 (which had not been adopted as of the end of 1997), and the finance committee had adopted terms of reference in April 1997. As of the end of 1997, the Board had developed a set of by-laws, but there were no terms of reference for the Board.

Board Effectiveness

Sources of information on the effectiveness of the Board are the minutes of Board meetings, and interviews with Board members and IIG administrators, as well as some stakeholders, and community and union respondents. The first question respondents were asked was whether the Board provides effective leadership and direction. One administrator did not have an opinion on whether the Board was effective. The other five all thought the Board was not effective, or not consistently so.

Respondents were asked to identify reasons for the Board's lack of effectiveness, or barriers that limited its effectiveness. The responses of the six administrators have been summarized into the following three themes (the number of respondents who made at least one response that fits into the theme is provided):

- Members of the Board have limited relevant experience (4 respondents): Board members need development to learn the functioning of a Board of a post-secondary institution. The one year term is too short for members to develop the needed experience and knowledge. The distinction between governance and operation of the IIG, and the responsibilities of the Board with respect to each, need to be clarified.

- There are problems in how the Board functions (4 respondents): Concerns include an ineffective committee structure, lack of terms of reference for the Board, and the use of meetings to present activity reports rather than to address issues.

- The Board was not sufficiently informed to effectively make decisions (3 respondents): Since the Board did not receive the reports until the meeting, they did not have time to review that material and make decisions. Administrators need development in how to effectively provide the Board with the necessary information.

Government stakeholders were also asked whether they thought the Board was effective. Two out of five thought they were not in a position to judge, one of the remaining three thought the Board was effective, and two others had some concerns. One of these thought the Board was not given substantive issues to deal with. The other was concerned that the Board did not provide effective leadership and cited the education council as an example; the respondent believed that the Board wanted an education council but was not providing leadership to ensure a council was established.

Seven Board members were asked whether there are any barriers that limit the Board's effectiveness. Board members identified five types of barriers. Three of these are similar to the barriers identified by administrators. Descriptions of the five barriers follow.

- There are problems in how the Board functions (5 respondents): Concerns include an ineffective committee structure, decisions being delayed when the Board cannot reach consensus, the Board is not used effectively and deals with too many mundane issues.

- Board members have many constraints on their time (4 respondents): Board members have many other time commitments. Some Board members attend Board meetings infrequently so they are not informed on the issues. Sometimes there have been problems achieving quorum for meetings.

- Members of the Board have limited relevant experience (4 respondents): Board members need development to learn the functioning of a Board of a post-secondary institution. The distinction between governance and operation of the IIG, and the responsibilities of the Board with respect to each, need to be clarified.

- The Board was not sufficiently informed to effectively make decisions (4 respondents): Since the Board did not receive the reports until the meeting, they did not have time to review that material and make decisions. In the past there have been problems due to inadequate records. Although the Board had lots of information, it did not necessarily have the information needed to make effective decisions.

- Senior Administrators control the Board (3 respondents): Senior Administrators keep information from the Board and decide what issues the Board will address. Decisions are made by the senior administrators before the issue is presented to the Board.

Board Representation

Respondents were asked who the key Aboriginal groups were with a stake in the IIG and whether the Board adequately represents these groups. The key aboriginal groups with a stake in the IIG identified by respondents are listed in Table 4-2. Also included in the table are the number of respondents that identified each group as a key aboriginal group with a stake in the IIG.

Respondents were mixed in their views on whether these groups were adequately represented on the Board. Three of the Board members interviewed were satisfied with the Board composition, while three were not. The seventh believed that the representation

issue was irrelevant, since Board representation does not affect access for students. Of the six administrators, one did not know and, of the remaining five, three thought the Board was not fully representative. Two did not directly answer the question; one of these observed that there were practical constraints that limit how many groups can be represented on the Board, and there were political reasons why groups not supporting the UBCIC could not be represented. The other respondent believed that IIG's association with the UBCIC did not present a barrier to access and the IIG needed an association with a strong political organization to survive.

Among the seven instructors, three did not know and one identified practical constraints that limited the size of the Board. The remaining three thought that the Board was not fully representative. Out of six non-instructional staff members interviewed, one did not know. Of the remaining five, three were satisfied with Board representation and one was not satisfied. Another believed that the association with the UBCIC was not a barrier to access.

Of the seven stakeholders asked, four did not have an opinion on the adequacy of Board representation. One of the remaining three was satisfied and two were not satisfied with Board representation.

TABLE 4-2
Key Aboriginal Groups with a Stake in the IIG Identified by Respondents

	Respondent Group				
Aboriginal Group	**Board**	**Administrators**	**Instructors**	**Staff**	**Stakeholders**
Communities that are members of the UBCIC	5	3	5	3	3
Extension communities	2	0	0	0	0
Communities with students at the IIG	1	1	1	0	0
Urban Aboriginal people	2	1	2	0	0
All Aboriginal people in BC	1	1	1	0	2
Aboriginal groups, and educational institutions with an interest	1	1	1	0	1
All Aboriginal people	1	2	3	1	2
IIG students	0	0	0	2	2
Number of respondents	7	6	7	6	7

Conclusions

Four Board members and three administrators believed that the Board was not provided with sufficient information for effective decision making. The responses of the Board members on a number of issues in this evaluation is consistent with the view that Board

members have not been fully informed. The findings suggest that Board members do not have a full understanding of some of the key issues facing the IIG, such as its funding, the extent of the morale problems among the IIG employees, or the level of distrust of many IIG employees for the IIG's senior administrators.

In addition to not being adequately informed, the findings suggest that the Board faces other barriers to its full effectiveness, including lack of experience and time constraints of its members, ineffective functioning of the Board, and too much control by senior administrators.

The budget issues of the IIG have been seriously affecting its ability to operate, yet the Board has not provided effective leadership on this issue. An indication of this is the issue of not getting quorum to deal with the budget in the spring of 1997. This problem resulted in delays so that the Board did not deal with the budget and layoffs until late June, 1997. Not all members of the Board were concerned about the problem of achieving quorum. The differences in whether the quorum issue was viewed as a problem may reflect differences in the importance that Board members attributed to the delays over meeting to deal with the budget. The fact that some members of the Board did not report any concerns about the delay may reflect their perception that the Board does not play an important role.

The Board has not been proactive in areas that effect the operation of the IIG. Minutes of the meetings of the Board revealed many issues on which the Board had not followed-up; the education council was one example. More than one member of the Board noted when interviewed that it was time for the IIG to conduct another search for a permanent President, yet the Board had taken no action on this issue.

Given all the shortcomings of the Board that have been identified, the shortcomings suggested by the respondents indicate that the Board of Governors of the IIG is not providing leadership or effective governance of the Institute.

There is no consensus on the appropriateness of the composition of the Board. At the time of writing, most members of the Board were also involved in the UBCIC. No Board could possibly represent all the different groups suggested by respondents. The key issue is whether the close association with the UBCIC inhibits the ability of the IIG to deliver its Mission. There are benefits of the association with the UBCIC, most notably access to the UBCIC's library. In addition, the very existence of the IIG is due to the lobbying efforts of the UBCIC. On the other hand, the association with the UBCIC may be a problem in how the IIG is perceived by external stakeholders, especially communities that are not members of the UBCIC. The IIG's association with the UBCIC does reinforce the perception that the IIG is not apolitical. There is some concern that some non-union bands will not fund their students to attend the IIG. The extent to which the association with the UBCIC is a barrier to access cannot be ascertained in this evaluation.

5. Summary of Conclusions

The IIG has a unique mandate to deliver a specialized, culturally relevant curriculum on Indigenous government studies, in a learning environment that supports the needs of Aboriginal students that have not been met in traditional mainstream educational institutions. This unique mandate gives rise to the following requirements for the IIG to deliver:

- student supports not typically found at mainstream institutions, such as:
  - resident elders to bring Indigenous philosophy and cultural values into the institution;
  - counsellors for support to students in coping with the traumatic effects of being a member of a marginalized group; and
  - academic support programs to address the students' academic weaknesses that are the result of ineffective mainstream educational experiences.
- library resources that deal with Indigenous government issues, as well as usual library resources found at post-secondary institutions; and
- programming delivered in communities throughout British Columbia as well as student supports and library resources for extension students.

5.1 Summary of Main Conclusions

Relevance

The mission of the IIG is viewed as a major strength of the Institute and is seen as highly relevant to the Aboriginal students who are attending the IIG. The education plan for the IIG is viewed as appropriate to its Mission. Students' expectations are being met and the majority are satisfied with the IIG's academic program. There are some students who are dissatisfied with how the mission is being realized and the IIG is facing some challenges in providing adequate support services to its students, especially those at the extension sites.

Implementation

With only nine weeks to create the Institute, from hiring staff and developing curriculum, to recruiting and registering students, the IIG has achieved a significant accomplishment. For the most part, the IIG is being implemented as intended. It has developed and delivered both a certificate program and an associate of arts degree program, and is in the process of developing a four-year Baccalaureate program.

The IIG has encountered two significant barriers that have hampered its implementation: lack of time for adequate planning and insufficient financial resources to carry out the plan fully. These barriers have resulted in two notable departures from the IIG's five year plan:

- The IIG has not achieved the enrollment targets as were projected in the plan, especially for the first and second year. Despite the slow start, by the end of the third year enrollments are expected to be almost on target, reflecting the fact that enrollments have grown faster than was originally planned. The lack of time for recruiting students for its first year is likely part of the reason for the low enrollments. Ineffective recruitment may have also been a factor. There are some potential barriers to access that may have also contributed to the low numbers: many Aboriginal students need to complete some academic upgrading before they can qualify to enter the IIG; and some students find it difficult to find sufficient funding to live in Vancouver while attending the IIG.

- The IIG has not made significant progress in implementing its extension plan to provide 80% of its program off campus, as set out in its five year plan. After delivering courses at two extension sites, the IIG has found that the cost per student of delivering extension programming is higher than the costs of delivering the program on its main campus. It is now re-considering its original plan with the aim of providing remote instruction where feasible. Providing effective support, such as library resources, counsellors and elders, to students at extension sites is another challenge for extension programming.

In addition, limited resources has hampered the IIG in its ability to meet the needs of its students for emotional support, even on the main campus.

Access

Access to the IIG appears to be hindered by insufficient funding for student support. Funding to bands for the post-secondary education of their members is not adequate to meet the need. Some students are not eligible for band funding and must rely on BCSAP student loans, although this option may not be available for all potential IIG students. The extent to which student funding limits access cannot be known from this evaluation, however, since the methodology used does not permit quantifying the extent to which financial barriers to access exist for potential IIG students. We do not know, for instance, how many potential IIG students would not be able to obtain sufficient funding to complete a program at the IIG.

Financial Resources

The IIG has experienced financial difficulties in its second and third years of operation. The financial problems stem, in part, from inadequate planning and insufficient financial monitoring in its first and second years. The IIG has failed to adequately budget for normal operating costs and has not always considered the financial impacts of decisions. In addition, the IIG has not been proactive in addressing its funding needs. They have taken little action on fundraising, and have not sought out additional government funding, for which they are eligible.

The IIG has faced many challenges that have had an impact on its ability to plan adequately for its financial needs. As already mentioned, the IIG is unique and hence has had no model upon which to base its design and budget. The IIG did not have a reasonable period at the beginning for planning, which has meant that administrators have had many demands competing for their attention. The most pressing demands associated with implementing the IIG, of program and curriculum development and student recruitment, have taken priority over financial planning and monitoring. The high turn-over of employees, especially of key administrators, including the bursar, registrar and president, and the lack of effective systems for monitoring expenditures, also likely had a role to play in the inadequate financial planning of the IIG.

Even without these shortcomings, though, the IIG would still have experienced financial difficulties because its funding has not adequately addressed the extras costs of providing extension and distance delivery, or the additional student supports needed to deliver on its mandate. Compounding the IIG's financial difficulties is its small size; the IIG does not have economies of scale. As a specialized program targeting a specialized audience, the IIG will always be small compared to institutions that provide a more general education to a more general audience. IIG's costs per FTE will, by necessity, be higher than the per FTE costs of mainstream post-secondary institutions, partly due to its small size and partly due to the extra supports needed for students to ensure their success.

Funding for the IIG has been through the Strategic Initiatives Agreement, which expires at the end of March 1998. With the ending of the Strategic Initiatives Agreement, the IIG will lose the federal portion of its funding. If the IIG is not able to replace this source of funding, it will have severe difficulties in delivering its programs in the future.

The funding mechanisms for the IIG do not adequately accommodate the unique financial needs of the IIG. Funding mechanisms do not provide for the IIG's further developmental costs and do not adequately address the extra costs of providing extension and distance delivery, or the additional student supports needed. For the IIG to be successful, the mechanisms for its funding will need to take into account its small size and unique characteristics that affect the cost of delivery.

Management

Although the employees of the IIG believe strongly in the mission of the IIG and want to see it succeed, the majority do not believe that management of the IIG has been effective. Employees reported a number of concerns about management, including flawed decision making and financial management, insufficient planning and consultation and inadequate communication.

The financial problems of the IIG have likely contributed to some of the morale problems, as well as to employees' lack of confidence in the abilities of management. Many feel that employees, through layoffs, are paying the price for mistakes made by management and that management is not accountable for the consequences of its decisions.

There have been extenuating circumstances that need to be considered when judging the effectiveness of IIG's management. For instance, the limited time the IIG had at the beginning to plan its development; the lack of a model to guide its development, hence the need for trial and error; and inadequate financial resources to fully implement its plan. Nonetheless, the fact that so many employees made negative comments about management reflects on the effectiveness of management itself.

The IIG's management has not been effective in encouraging the confidence and support of the employees of the Institute and in dealing with their concerns. Management has not been effectively involving employees in planning and decision making and, as a consequence, has not been making the best use of its human resources. Communication between management and employees has not been effective; this is a fundamental weakness and underlies the other management problems. The poor relations that have developed between the management and the majority of the IIG's employees, and the low morale among employees, are serious problems that will, if not corrected, affect the operation of the IIG.

Governance

The members of the IIG Board of Governors are not well informed about the issues facing the IIG and do not appear to be aware of the extent of the morale problems among the IIG employees, or the level of distrust that many employees have for the IIG's senior administration. The Board has not provided effective leadership for the Institute and has not been proactive in addressing issues. Instead, the Board has taken a passive role and let senior administrators make the decisions.

5.2 Overall Conclusions

The evaluation of the IIG was done with the purpose of identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the IIG, and determining how the further development of the Institute can be enhanced to ensure its success. Although this evaluation has uncovered some significant challenges for the IIG to resolve, it has also identified important strengths of the Institute. These strengths should not be overshadowed by the problems that have been detected.

To be useful, the evaluation has had to focus on the weaknesses of the IIG to understand how the weaknesses can be overcome. The findings must be tempered by the fact that the IIG was just completing its second year of operation when this evaluation began. It is normal for a complex organization such as a post-secondary institution to experience problems in the early stages of its development. The IIG has the additional challenge of attempting to provide post-secondary education that reflects Indigenous values, culture and experience, and hence has not been able to rely on mainstream post-secondary institutions as models for its development.

A major strength of the IIG is the high degree of commitment of its administrators, instructors and non-instructional staff to the Institute's mission of *"empowering Indigenous Peoples to exercise their right of self-determination in their territories in ways*

which fully reflect Indigenous philosophy, values, and experience throughout the world." They feel they are championing the cause of self-determination of Aboriginal peoples. They have high expectations of the Institute and recognize the importance of what it can achieve.

The IIG's mission is highly relevant to the Aboriginal students who are attending the IIG. The importance of the IIG to its students is reflected in the views they expressed about the IIG:

- *"It's exciting to see students learn, to enrich themselves. It's important to have the curriculum validate me...about what I went through [experiences of colonization]."*
- *"I'm more articulate, confident about my knowledge. [Education at the IIG] made me stronger in my own community."*
- *"I like the IIG 'cause of its personal feel-a community, but it still has the required academics to prepare you for careers."*
- *"I like the curriculum best...it's been an eye-opener."*
- *"I'm glad that we have such an institution to give past history and current issues...I wish there had been a school like this earlier. It's helped me with knowledge to grow and change."*
- *"The establishment of IIG by the First Nation of BC is a very positive step towards fulfillment of First Nations Canada's jurisdiction over the education of their children and people. May IIG's vision and goals be a success!!"*

With their academic program, the IIG is doing pioneering work towards the realization of the mission. The commitment of the people of the IIG, their sense of purpose, and the academic program they have worked together to develop, are strengths upon which the IIG can build.

The usefulness of a formative evaluation depends on its ability to provide the IIG Board and government with information needed so that problems can be addressed. This evaluation has identified some significant challenges for the IIG. The morale problems and communication difficulties between the senior administration and the IIG's employees are issues that only the IIG can address. The need for better planning and Board development are also areas to be addressed by the IIG. To solve the IIG's financial challenges, though, partnerships with both the provincial and federal governments will be needed. Indigenous communities also have a role to play to helping the IIG to succeed.

The IIG has the necessary building blocks for success: a highly relevant mission and program, and dedicated employees and administrators who have a sense of purpose. Its problems notwithstanding, the IIG has made an impressive beginning. With the information provided in this evaluation, if utilized, the IIG will be able to build on its strengths and ensure that it has a successful future.

Appendix A

A.1 Activities that have Improved the Financial Record and Reporting System

- Relocated the accounting office to North Vancouver from Kamloops.

- Evaluated the records system, resulting in the development of financial policies and procedures to increase efficiency and effectiveness. Evaluated coding and performed block transfers, improved system of internal controls and performed payroll audit.

- Restructured the accounting system to meet the operational realities of the Institute. Changed the reporting structure from a system designed to meet the reporting requirements of HRDC, to one that met the reporting requirements of a diverse post-secondary educational institution. Modified the Chart of Accounts to reflect the standard chart of accounts and framework utilized in other post-secondary institutions. Established a financial filing system.

- Participated in the provincial systemization initiatives relative to the development of an integrated financial, student records and human resource system. Due to financial constraints and lack of provincial funding the Institute had to pursue stand alone systems.

- Implemented an integrated accounting software package relative to general ledger reporting, (payroll and accounts payable modules as well). This software package leaves a clear, well-documented audit trail and has increased efficiency. In conjunction with Accpac, spreadsheets are utilized to further enhance the financial monitoring, reporting and evaluation of the IIG's financial resources.

- Prepare monthly accruals to reflect more accurate financial information. As well as preparation of monthly bank reconciliation and other supporting schedules for revenue, expenditure and balance sheet accounts included in the financial statements.

- Developed a framework to interface student records and match student accounts receivable to financial information in statements.

- Reduced audit cost through tendering process and in-house performance of related year-end items.

- Pro-active in adopting changes to the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants' Handbook regarding Capital Asset reporting and recording as per section 44.30 "Capital Assets Held by not for Profit Organizations". For the fiscal years ended March 31/96 to March 31/98 the IIG purchased capital assets out of their start up/operating funds, due to this it is necessary for the IIG to record amortization/ depreciation expense annually in the operating budget. Future capital purchases will be

made out of capital allocations received in the form of grants and donations. The annual amortization or depreciation for these future purchases will be expensed against the capital retained earnings account and future purchases will be excluded from the operating envelope.

A.2 Activities that Summarize Current and Proposed Financial Management Practices at the IIG

- Preparation of annual operating budget and implementation of mid-year budget review for fiscal 1997-1998. In future fiscal periods the budget reviews will be performed on a quarterly basis.

- In the 1998/1999 fiscal year the annual budget has been prepared in tandem with a cash flow analysis. These control documents are updated with actual expenditures monthly and monitored for any variances.

- Preparation of monthly financial statements with supporting documentation and schedules.

- Develop terms of reference for the Finance Committee of the Board.

- Submitted for approval an Accountability Framework for the Executive Committee.

- Consult with designer of Class Act student information system to implement improvements to the student database with the objective of greater efficiency and effectiveness. This will allow the IIG to customize reports for academic planning and provincial reporting.

- Develop a Human Resource reporting system that will track annual vacation, sick days and other leave credits. As well, the reporting system will provide adequate position control.

Appendix B

This appendix contains lists of the following interview samples:

- Table B-1: IIG Board of Governors and Union of BC Indian Chiefs
- Table B-2: IIG Administrators, instructors and other staff
- Table B-3: External Stakeholders

TABLE B-1
IIG Board of Governors and Union Interviewees

Name	Organization/Community	Role
John Elliott	Saanich Indian School Board, UBCIC	Board & Saanich Extension
Louise Mandell	Vancouver	Board
Judge Alfred Scow	Vancouver	Board
Nathan Spinks	Lytton Band	Board
Saul Terry	Union of BC Indian Chiefs, President	Board Chair and Union President
Theo Collins	IIG Faculty Representative	Board and IIG faculty
Brenda Wesley	Student Representative — IIG Vancouver Main Campus	Board and IIG student
Mr. Irvine Charleyboy	Alexis Creek Band, Chilanko Forks	Chiefs Council of the Union

TABLE B-2 IIG Administration, Instructors and Other Staff	
Name	**Title**
Bernard Charles	IIG Interim President, Member of Chief's Council, UBCIC
Russell Nahdee	Student Development Counsellor
Dan Gottesman	Dean of Academic Affairs
Rosine Ryan-Lewis	Executive Assistant to the Dean and Information Officer
Jennie Blankinship	Director of Extension
Lix Lopez	Director of International
David Kolot	Bursar
Arlene Guerin	Registrar
Wendy Ancell	Head Librarian
Glen Douglas	Resident Elder
Flora Dawson	Resident Elder
Sylvia Walsh	Full-time faculty and former Dean of Student Affairs
Eric Ostrowidski	Full-time faculty
John Rowlandson	Full-time faculty
Bernice Heather	Full-time faculty
Alejandro Palacios	Full-time faculty
Tim Michel	Full-time faculty
Theo Collins	Full-time faculty
Lori Montour	Sessional instructor
John McBride	Sessional instructor

TABLE B-3
External Stakeholders

Name	Organization	Purpose
Frank Gellin	Ex. Director, BC Council on Admissions and Transfer	Credit transfer agreements
Sharon Mean	Dean, Academic Programs, OLA	Credit transfer agreements
Robin Fisher	Dean of Arts and Science, University of Northern BC	Credit transfer agreements
Glen Sinclair	Former Ex. Director, Association of Aboriginal Post-Secondary Institutions (AAPSI)	Variety of issues, including funding for aboriginal students
Grace Mirehouse	Executive Director, Director & AAPSI Chair, Native Education Centre, Vancouver, Vancouver	Variety of issues, including funding for aboriginal students
Gorden Antoine	Chief, Coldwater Band, Nicola Valley Institute of Technology	Variety of issues, including funding for aboriginal students
Joanne Archibald	Director, House of Learning, UBC	Variety of issues, including funding for aboriginal students
Rob Henderson	A/ Manager, Aboriginal Education, MoEST	Aboriginal education issues.
Nick Rubidge	Director, Colleges and Institutes Planning Branch, MoEST	Branch responsible for direction to IIG, NVIT, degree and program approval, governance
Tom Austin	Director, Post Secondary Finance and Accountability, MoEST	Accountability Initiative and Ministry reporting requirements
Jim VanStone	Director, Student Support	Student funding
Michelle Lanuele	HRDC, Project Officer working for Shirley Robinson, Director External Relations	Bilateral agreement on aboriginal post-secondary education
Ian Munro	HRDC	Aboriginal education & funding
Darrel MacLeod	Indian Affairs	Aboriginal education issues

Appendix C

Respondents' Suggestions

Recruitment

IIG administrators suggested a number of recruitment activities:

- increase public exposure through the media;
- increase networking with other institutions and agencies that could feed students to IIG;
- make partnerships with other agencies to share resources;
- make more effective use of well-established family and political relationships to raise the profile of the IIG in communities;
- provide a refined and more rigorous assessment of whether students meet eligibility requirements and provide conditional admission for those requiring upgrading;
- broaden marketing of the IIG video; and
- follow up any material issued to communities with a visit from IIG Elders to the elders of the Aboriginal community.

Board members made the following suggestions:

- lobby the government about its fiduciary responsibility to provide *more* funding, pointing out that recruitment cannot be effective if bands do not have money to send their students to the IIG;
- in addition to regular recruitment efforts, someone should act as an "ambassador" for the IIG, and visit communities and raise the profile of the IIG; and
- use a number of print media avenues such as the *West Ender*, *Georgia Strait*, community newsletters, in addition to the ongoing use of the UBCIC newsletter.

Suggestions made by external stakeholders follow:

- work with other aboriginal post-secondary institutions to benefit from their experience;
- attend high school career fairs;
- focus efforts on grade 11 and 12 students at aboriginal institutions;

- invite high school and college students to visit the IIG and give them a tour of the Institute;
- link the IIG web site with those of other institutions;
- have IIG personnel visit schools;
- develop linkages with educational co-ordinators;
- get involved in the Native adult instructor program to raise awareness of the IIG; and
- make sure Human Resources Centres have information about the IIG.

Student Funding Options

In addition to the common funding options described in the report, respondents suggested some other options that may be available to IIG students. These are the other funding options as suggested by respondents (note: the names of these options may not be correct, and some options may not exist or may not be relevant):

- the British Columbia Grant program;
- the Federal Special Opportunity Grant (for part-time or disabled students);
- a provincial special program that provides additional funding for students with disabilities;
- Adult Basic Education funding;
- the British Columbia Work Study program;
- the Indian Student Support Program funds;
- the First Citizens Fund for non-status Aboriginal people (provincially funded);
- employment, and/or funding support from employers;
- employment insurance;
- Regional Bilateral Agreements funds that can be accessed through Human Resources Development Canada; and
- employment opportunities such as the federal government native internship program.

Financial Resources

Ten respondents (government and other stakeholders, and the member of the UBCIC) were asked for fundraising suggestions, and six government stakeholders were asked for other funding options for the IIG. These are all the suggestions offered:

- solicit corporate sponsorship such as BC Tel or BC Hydro;
- hold car and truck lotteries; this would raise money and get the IIG's name known in Aboriginal communities; make a partnership with a car dealership; could do this monthly;
- community bingo may work after the IIG's name is known;
- establish credibility before seeking foundation support;
- set up a permanent IIG foundation; contributors are looking for places that have a lasting foundation so donations do not get used for operating costs;
- work with a-political groups to fund-raise, such as the National Aboriginal Achievement Foundation;
- the Department of Indian Affairs only funds one institution: the Saskatchewan Indian Federated College; maybe IIG could lobby the federal government for direct support;
- should consider federal funding based on Aboriginal entitlement;
- try to get financial support from some of the bands;
- a consortium of Bands could be created to provide funding;
- the IIG could look for mentoring from other institutes; BCIT and Douglas College are very adept at fundraising;
- the IIG could seek additional revenue by contracting with the provincial government to provide special services through the Skills Development Division and BC Benefits; and
- the federal Regional Bilateral Agreement may allocate money to the IIG to purchase training for clients.

Management Effectiveness

Employees made the following suggestions for how IIG management can be improved in the future:

- management should be more accountable for its decisions;
- bring indigenous values into the process of managing the IIG;
- employees and management need to work as a team;
- need a consultative process: committees could be organized to ensure that there's participation in the decision-making process;
- management needs to actively seek feedback on issues; need to see employees as a group to be consulted;
- decisions need to be communicated to everyone;
- form an education council (three respondents offered this as a suggestion to improving management);
- encourage staff to organize to improve communication;
- provide job descriptions in letters of employment; with clear working conditions and responsibilities stated so people know what is expected of them;
- administrators need to have their roles defined so they don't interfere with the roles of others;
- develop a clear personnel evaluation process that employees know;
- develop a written policies and procedures manual after consultation;
- need more government intervention; need government to pick Board members;
- the Board needs to be more active and participate in planning;
- bring in experts to help in forming a strategic plan for the IIG;
- develop a professional code of ethics; and
- hold regular meetings with staff and use Robert's Rules of Order in meetings.

Senior Administrators offered the following suggestions to improve the effectiveness of managing the IIG:

- continue to improve information systems;
- need a more systematic approach to communication and planning;
- need to provide a supportive atmosphere and assign more responsibility to people as their skills become apparent;
- within the Act the Institute has to have an education council. We need to look at the Institute and determine how to have that here with our limited staff; what it should look like and how it should relate to the Board, and to the executive;
- make planning more inclusive; need to expand the planning process to incorporate views of students, communities, etc.;
- improve planning, both short-term and long-term; need to now look at where the IIG is and tie budgeting and operational plans into enrollments;
- revisit the five year plan, looking at its accomplishments and at what some of the barriers have been; then do some planning for the next five years and deal with the major issues in the plan which would relate to areas like facilities planning, capital planning and how these interface with accessibility;
- work on Board development and assist the Board to use the committee structure as a vehicle; and
- need to find a balance between what the Act requires and the requirements of Indigenous law and principles; this needs to be clarified; need to be more inclusive and make more use of consensus approach to decision making; this takes more time.

Suggestions by the Board on management:

- review job descriptions of the people in administration;
- the salaries of the three administrators are too high; this is affecting all the finances;
- the IIG needs to find a permanent President this year; very competitive market in finding qualified Aboriginal person for President;
- an Education Council would be good for advice on the Academic program;
- planning would be improved by involving more people;
- need to develop trust and policies that can be consistently applied;

- there needs to be regular meetings with staff to keep information flowing, both ways, so people feel they are being heard;

- management does not provide direction; they need to make short-term and long-term plans; and

- the hierarchy of the institute is a contradiction to consensual ways of making decisions and understanding of power; see a genuine dialogue on the need for a more consensual way of decision making among those working at the IIG.

Communication

External stakeholders had a number of suggestions for improving communication with the IIG:

- de-politicize the relationship of IIG's management with the Ministry;

- have a President like other institutions, not an Interim President;

- HRDC could help distribute communication to local Human Resource Centres and Regional Council Management Boards, but it's more effective if the IIG does this itself;

- meet on a more regular basis with external stakeholders;

- need to work together more with other aboriginal organizations;

- should be making a real effort to communicate to senior high school students and other post-secondary institutions;

- partner with other organizations for delivery of distance education instruction and for college preparation; and

- IIG should start regular reporting to ministry: what they are doing, their challenges and plans; IIG is not known in the Ministry, except for a few people.

Governance

Board members were also asked for suggestions on how the Board could be more effective:

- the Board needs to be advised on what are Board issues and what are operational issues and the proper functions of the Board once a year, as composition of Board keeps changing;

- make the term for Board members two years;

- the President and staff should make more effective use of the Board by making reports to the Board;
- Board members should have more informal contact with the IIG to become more familiar with it;
- Board members need to have time to review information and make decisions; Board members should get reports before meetings so they can read them;
- may need to re-evaluate committee structure to decide what is useful to ensure that the type of committees and the way they operate allows for effective decision making; and
- ensure there is quorum for meetings.

Administrators made the following suggestions for improving governance of the IIG:

- establish a more effective committee structure which can be pro-active about issues;
- the Board needs better information to make better decisions;
- need to get reports to Board members ahead of meetings; and
- hold Board meetings every 2 months rather than monthly to alleviate the time crunch for members.